REFERENCE LIBRARY * HOUGHTON MIFFLIN CO. * BOSTON, MASS.
Archive
Collection

This book may not leave the Offices
and if borrowed must be returned within 7 days

# ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

# ELIZABETHAN DRAMA 1558-1642

A History of the Drama in England from the Accession of Queen Elizabeth to the Closing of the Theaters, to which is prefixed a Résumé of the Earlier Drama from its Beginnings

*BY FELIX E. SCHELLING*

*Professor in the University of Pennsylvania*

TWO VOLUMES VOLUME TWO

*BOSTON AND NEW YORK*
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & COMPANY
1908

COPYRIGHT 1908 BY FELIX E. SCHELLING

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

*Published February 1908*

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME II


## XIII. HISTORY AND TRAGEDY ON CLASSICAL MYTH AND STORY

Influence of ancient drama in England, 1. — Seneca in the academic drama, and at court, 2. — French Seneca in England, 5. — Garnier imitated and translated, 6. — Samuel Daniel and his Senecan plays, *Cleopatra* and *Philotas*, 8. — Fulke Greville, his *Alaham* and *Mustapha*, 10. — Sir William Alexander, his *Monarchic Tragedies*, 14. — Early popular plays on classical subjects, 16. — Lodge's *Marius and Sulla*, *The Wars of Cyrus*, and Marlowe and Nash's *Dido*, 16. — Thomas Heywood's dramatized mythology, 19. — Plays on Julius Cæsar, 21. — Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar*, 23. — Jonson's *Sejanus*, 24. — Marston's *Sophonisba*, and Heywood's *Lucrece*, 27. — Classical tragedies at the universities, 27. — Shakespeare's later plays on classical subjects: *Coriolanus*, *Timon of Athens*, *Pericles*, 28. — Shakespeare's interest in character, 31. — Jonson's *Catiline*, 32. — Jonson in classical tragedy, 33. — *The Tragedy of Nero*, 34. — Minor plays of the type, 35. — Fletcherian dramas in classic setting, *The Humorous Lieutenant*, 37. — *The Virgin Martyr*, *Valentinian*, *The Roman Actor*, and other plays of Fletcher and Massinger of the type, 39. — Thomas May and his classical tragedies, 43. — Minor writers of later plays on classical subjects, 45. — Nathaniel Richards, his *Messalina*, 49.

## XIV. THE COLLEGE DRAMA

Academic and popular drama contrasted, 51. — Popular plays at the universities, 52. — Early theatrical performances at Oxford and Cambridge, 53. — Queen Elizabeth at Cambridge, 1564, 56. — The queen at Oxford, 1566, 57. — William Gager, his Latin plays and controversy with Rainolds, 59. — Satirical quality of college plays, 60. — *Pedantius*, 62. — *Bellum Grammaticale*, 63. — The Parnassus plays, 65. — Their authorship and interpretation, 67. — Their allusions to Shakespeare and others, 68. — *Narcissus* and *Lingua*, 70. — Theatromania at

Oxford, 73. — Academic Latin tragedies: Gwinn's *Nero*, Alabaster's *Roxana*, 75. — Italian models for academic comedy, 77. — *Albumazar* and *Ignoramus*, 78. — Milton's strictures on the latter play, 79. — Pastoral influences on academic plays, 79. — Persistence of allegory and satire, 81. — School plays: *Apollo Shroving*, 82. — Academic plays in the reign of Charles I, 83. — Thomas Randolph, his dialogues and plays, *The Jealous Lovers* and *The Muses' Looking Glass*, 85. — Hausted's plays and Cowley's, 87. — Charles' visit to Oxford, 1636, 88. — Strode's *Floating Island* and its relation to Prynne's *Histriomastix*, 89. — Jonson and Shakespeare at the universities, 91.

XV. THE ENGLISH MASQUE

The masque defined, 93. — Its foreign and English sources, 95. — The queen's entertainment at Kenilworth, 1575, 97. — Sidney's *Lady of May*, 98. — Masques of the *Gesta Grayorum*, 1597, 98. — The accession of James gives impetus to the masque, 101. — Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, 102. — Jonson's activity as a deviser of masques; his *Masque of Blackness* and *Hymenæi*, 103. — Campion's *Phœbus' Knights*, 107. — Jonson's *Masque of Queens*; the antimasque, 108. — Jonson and Daniel in rivalry, 110. — *Tethys' Festival*, 111. — Jonson's masques of 1610–12, 113. — Grand masques of the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth; Campion, Chapman, and Beaumont the contrivers, 115. — Bacon as a patron of the masque, 117. — Campion's later masques, 118. — Jonson's masques of 1615–18, 119. — William Browne's *Ulysses and Circe*, and masques by other hands, 120. — Jonson's quarrel with Inigo Jones, 122. — The last group of Jonson's masques, 123. — Characteristics of the Jacobean masque; its use of allegory, classical allusion, and satire, 124. — Degeneracy of the antimasque, 126. — Place of the masque and its influence on the drama, 127. — Jonson's entertainments for King Charles, 131. — Shirley's *Triumph of Peace*, 131. — Carew's *Cœlum Britannicum*, 132. — Milton's *Comus* and *Arcades*, 133. — The masques of Davenant, 135. — Masque-like plays, 136.

XVI. THE PASTORAL DRAMA

The pastoral mode; its origin and introduction into England, 139. — The pastoral idea, its artificiality, 140. — English love of country, 142. — The pastoral drama in Italy; Tasso's *Aminta;*

Guarini's *Il Pastor Fido*, 143. — English translations of Italian pastorals, 144. — Pastoral elements in earlier Elizabethan entertainments; Gascoigne at Kenilworth, 144. — Sidney's *Lady of May*, 145. — Jonson's *Complaint of the Satyrs*, 146. — Pastoral elements in Elizabethan plays, Peele's *Arraignment of Paris*, 147. — The mythological pastoral school, 148. — Pastoral elements in Lyly, *Love's Metamorphosis* and his other court dramas, 149. — *The Maid's Metamorphosis*, 151. — The pastoral element in minor comedies, 151. — Robin Hood, the embodiment of the English ideal of free rural life, 153. — Plays on Robin Hood, 153. — The relation of *As You Like It* to the pastoral, 154. — True pastoral drama in England, 156. — Daniel's *Queen's Arcadia*, 156. — John Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*, 158. — The alleged allegory of this play, 160. — *The Winter's Tale*, 161. — Daborne's *Poor Man's Comfort*, 162. — Daniel's *Hymen's Triumph*, 163. — Phineas Fletcher's piscatory, *Sicelides*, 164. — Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, 166. — Jonson and Daniel in rivalry in the pastoral, 167. — Composite art of *The Sad Shepherd*, 168. — Minor pastoral dramas of Shirley, Goffe, and others, 169. — Knevet and Tatham, their pastoral plays in the provinces, 171. — Montague's prose play, *The Shepherds' Paradise*, its relation to Prynne's *Histriomastix*, 173. — Randolph's *Amyntas*, 174. — The pastorals of Rutter, Cowley, Glapthorne, and other Carolan writers, 175. — Mixed foreign and native elements in English pastoral plays, 177. — Jonson and Shakespeare and the pastoral, 180.

XVII. TRAGICOMEDY AND "ROMANCE"

Tragicomedy defined, 182. — Serious comedy and the drama of reconciliation, 183. — Realistic and romantic tragicomedy; the "romance," 184. — Beaumont and Fletcher, their relations to each other, and to other dramatists, 184. — Internal tests distinguishing the work of Beaumont and Fletcher, 186. — Difficulties in the application of these tests, 189. — Stage history of Beaumont and Fletcher, 189. — Varieties of the romantic drama, 190. — *Philaster* and the group to which it belongs, 193. — Types in *Philaster*, 195. — *A King and No King*, 196. — Shakespeare's "romances," 197. — *Pericles*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 198. — *Cymbeline*, 199. — The personages of Shakespeare's "romances" not wanting in individuality, 200. — *The Winter's Tale*, 200. — *The Tempest*, 202. — Shakespearean "ro-

mance" not profoundly influenced by Fletcherian tragicomedy, 203. — Other tragicomedies of Fletcher, 204. — Fletcher's romantic plays on Spanish sources: *The Chances*, 206. — *The Pilgrim*, *Women Pleased*, and *The Spanish Curate*, 208. — *The Island Princess* and other plays on Spanish sources, 211. — *Love's Cure*, probably not Fletcher's, 214. — Middleton and Rowley's *Spanish Gipsy*, 216. — Fletcher's *Mad Lover*, *Beggars' Bush*, and other plays, 218. — Shakespearean reminiscences in Fletcher, 220. — *The Knight of Malta*, a typical tragicomedy of Fletcher, 220. — *The Loyal Subject*, 223. — Fletcher and Heywood's treatment of the subject, the test of loyalty, 224. — The combat for honors in *The Laws of Candy*, 226. — *The Lovers' Progress*, 227. — Massinger's tragicomedies: *The Maid of Honor* and *The Renegado*, 230. — Massinger's Roman Catholicism, 231. — His *Grand Duke of Florence* and other tragicomedies, 232. — Massinger's moral earnestness, characterization, and stagecraft, 234. — Influence of Fletcherian tragicomedy on contemporary and later plays, 235. — Lesser tragicomedies: *Swetnam* and other "women's plays," 238.

XVIII. LATER COMEDY OF MANNERS

Contrasted influences of Jonson and Middleton on later comedy, 240. — Stage history, 1614–25, 241. — Late comedies of the elder dramatists, 244. — English and foreign setting in comedy, 246. — Later comedies of Fletcher, 247. — *The Little French Lawyer*, *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, and other comedies, 248. — Types in the comedies of Fletcher, 250. — Massinger's comedies of London life: *The City Madam* and *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, 252. — Massinger's combination of Middletonian and Jonsonian comedy, 254. — His *Guardian*, 255. — May's *Old Couple*, 258. — The comedies of Davenport, 259. — Later comedies of Heywood and William Rowley, 262. — The last dramas of Jonson: *The Staple of News*, *The New Inn*, *The Magnetic Lady*, 264. — Last days of Jonson, 267. — Richard Brome, his *Northern Lass*, *A Jovial Crew*, and other comedies, 269. — Other dramatical sons of Jonson: Marmion, Cartwright, and Glapthorne, 275. — Comedies of Cockayne and Newcastle, 281. — James Shirley, 284. — *The Witty Fair One*, *The Ball*, and other comedies of Shirley, 288. — His *Gamester*, *The Example* and other comedies of manners, 293. — Shirley as a writer of comedy, 295. — John Ford in comedy: his

*Fancies* and *The Lady's Trial*, 297. — Early comedies of Davenant, 299. — *The Parson's Wedding*, by Thomas Killigrew, 302. — Minor realistic comedies of the last years of the old drama, 302.

XIX. DECADENT ROMANCE

Decadent romanticism the "note" of the drama of Charles I, 307. — Theatrical repertory of the reign; continued popularity of the older dramatists, 308. — Stage history, 1625–42, 310. — Trend of the drama away from fact, 311. — The romantic plays of Shirley, 312. — His lighter comedies: *The Opportunity*, and other plays, 314. — His "historical" tragicomedies: *The Young Admiral*, *The Coronation*, *The Politician*, 316. — Shirley's tragicomedies of court intrigue: *The Royal Master*, and other plays, 320. — *The Traitor*, *The Cardinal*, and other tragedies of Shirley, 322. — Shirley in tragedy, 326. — John Ford: his *Lover's Melancholy*, 327. — His romantic tragedies, *Love's Sacrifice*, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, *The Broken Heart*, 329. — Ford's originality, ethical taint, and dramatic method, 333. — The tragicomedies of Richard Brome: his *Queen and Concubine*, and other plays, 336. — Arthur Wilson and his plays, 338. — Sir William Davenant, his *Albovine*, and other earlier dramas, 340. — Davenant and the forebears of the heroic drama: *Love and Honor* and *The Fair Favorite*, 343. — The cult of Platonic love, and its effect on the drama, 345. — Davenant's *Platonic Lovers*, 347. — Sources of the heroic play, 349. — Lodowick Carlell and his stage romances, 352. — The tragicomedies of Thomas Killigrew, 356. — Recrudescence of heroical romance, 359. — Sir John Suckling: his *Aglaura*, *The Goblins*, and *Brennoralt*, 361. — Minor romantic dramas of the later years of Charles I, 364. — Puritan attack on the stage and final suppression of the acting of plays, 369.

XX. THE DRAMA IN RETROSPECT

Census of plays written between 1558 and 1642, 371. — The gentleman author and the popular playwright, 374. — Personal relations of the dramatists, 377. — Shakespeare and Jonson, their relations to each other and to others, their contemporaries, 379. — The associations of Dekker, Heywood, and others, 381 — Beaumont and Fletcher in their relations to Shakespeare, Massinger, and other playwrights, 383. — Jonson in the reign

of Charles; and Shirley, last of the great dramatists, 385. — The lead of Shakespeare's company, 386. — The academic and the vernacular drama, 387. — London actors in the provinces and abroad, 389. — Résumé of the course of the drama: the roots of Elizabethan drama in its medieval forebears, 393. — The vital element of medieval drama, its touch with life, 396. — Services of John Heywood to the early drama, 397. — Legend, balladry, and medieval story and the drama, 397. — Medieval and Renaissance elements in Lyly, 399. — Classical influence in English comedy and tragedy, 400. — The variety of Elizabethan drama presaged in the first decades of the reign, 402. — The period of Lyly, 1579–88, 404. — The first great tragedies, and the period of Marlowe, 1588–93, 405. — Shakespeare at his height in history and romantic comedy, 1593–1603, 407. — Jonson's dramatic satire and comedy of humors, and Marston's revival of the tragedy of revenge, 409. — The masque and the pastoral, the court's contributions to the drama of King James, 411. — The popular drama in the reign of James: Shakespeare in romantic tragedy and comedy; Middletonian comedy of manners, 412. — Shakespeare's "romances" and Fletcherian tragicomedy, 416. — The years 1603–12 *par excellence* the period of Jonson, 418. — Dramas of contemporary political allusion, 418. — The period of Fletcher, 1612–25, 419. — Degeneracy of late Jacobean and Carolan dramas, 421. — Fletcherian example in the earlier years of King Charles, 423. — The new comedy of manners and the persistence of Jonsonian comedy, 425. — Degenerate tragicomedy and the Restoration heroic play, 426. — The period of Shirley, 1625–42, 427. — Epilogue, 429.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY . . . . . 433

A LIST OF PLAYS AND LIKE PRODUCTIONS WRITTEN, ACTED, OR PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND BETWEEN THE YEARS 1558 AND 1642 . . . . . 538

INDEX . . . . . 625

# ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

# A HISTORY OF ELIZABETHAN DRAMA

## XIII

### HISTORY AND TRAGEDY ON CLASSICAL MYTH AND STORY

THE influence of the ancients on English drama is coeval with the drama itself. But whether in theme, treatment, or style, classical influences were filtered through many foreign channels, imbibing on the way qualities of each, and, even when least so affected, limited and confined in tragedy to one Latin and one Greek dramatist. It has been said that "Euripidean tragedy leavened the dramatic poetry of every cultured nation in Europe through all the centuries while Æschylus and Sophocles fed the worms in the libraries." And if we recall how close a follower of Euripides was Seneca with all his differences and departures from classical precedent, and how far, moreover, later Greek comedy (and through it Plautus and Terence, with "Christian Terence," the School Drama, and the earlier artistic imitations of the Roman dramatists to follow) partook of the nature of that ultimate inspiration, it is not too much to affirm that the Euripidean idea of tragedy is practically all that the Europe of the Renaissance took over from the drama of the ancients. As to variety of channels and influences in England, we

Influence of ancient drama in England.

have the *Alcmæon* of Euripides, acted (doubtless in Latin) in 1573, and *Hippolytus* six years later; we have Euripides translated into Latin by Buchanan, as well as Seneca into English in the *Tenne Tragedies*, 1559–1581; Euripides by way of Seneca and Dolce, in Gascoigne's *Jocasta*, 1566; Seneca by way of Garnier, in Kyd's *Cornelia;* and Seneca popularized and Anglicized — perhaps better re-Italianated — in Marston's *Antonio and Mellida*, 1599. We may therefore agree with Brandl's distinction of a Euripidean and a Senecan type of classical influence on early English tragedy, and add a distinctively Italian and, for later time, a French Seneca as well.[1] But of these more below.

Earlier Senecan influences.

A word has been said of Buchanan.[2] It was that excellent Scottish humanist who translated the *Medea* and *Alcestis* into Latin about 1540, and in so doing contributed one of the influences which effected a transfer from allegory to actual drama in the school plays of his time. Buchanan's biblical plays are almost as Euripidean as these translations. The ground thus once broken, the other Greek tragedians were recalled by the scholars, and we have a *Philoctetes* translated by Ascham, the princes' tutor, *Iphigenia* by Lady Jane Lumley, and *Antigone* by the poet Thomas Watson, all between 1564 and 1581, and all "done into Latin." [3] Nor can these translations be regarded as purely literary exercises; for the lists of plays acted at court, at the universities, and at the

[1] Brandl, p. lxxxvii.

[2] Above, i, pp. 33–35, 83.

[3] *King's MSS.* xv, A, British Museum. Hazlitt, *Manual*, 116. Lady Lumley died in March, 1576. *Ibid.* 14, *Sophoclis Antigone, Interprete Thoma Watsono*, 1581.

inns of court during this period contain an *Effiginia*, an *Alcmæon*, "*Hypolitus*," and *Œdipus*, besides other classical titles — *Meleager*, *Philotas*, and *Agamemnon and Ulysses* — which disclose imitation as well as translations of ancient drama.[1] That scholars even should soon prefer the turgid eloquence of Seneca to the purer and chaster Greek poets was a thing to be expected. Seneca's very differences and departures from classical usage made for his popularity as suggested above, and, moreover, he wrote in Latin, the familiar learned tongue. Of early Senecan influence on the drama something has already been said in this book.[2] Through translation, imitation, and adaptation this influence was gradually assimilated in the popular drama, until, from the stiff and stately commonplaces of Hughes and Sackville, it came to inspire the inventive eloquence of Kyd and fire the poetic flights of Marlowe. So far as the popular drama is concerned, the material influence of Seneca reaches its height in the Marstonian tragedy of revenge. Subtler is the Senecan example in its effects on the gnomic moralizing of Chapman.[3]

Seneca as a model at court

But if Seneca thus emerged from the task of the school and the amusement of the inns of court to appear on the boards of the London stage, the Roman poet continued in fashion and in a stricter cult in the inner circles of the court and the universities which had given to the study of his works in England its

[1] *Revels' Accounts*, *passim*. The classical tragedies at Oxford and Cambridge between 1564 and 1582 include a *Dido*, *Progne*, *Œdipus*, *Ulysses Redux*, and *Meleager*. See below, pp. 57–60.

[2] Above, i, pp. 83, 96–98.

[3] See, especially, the rôle of Clermont in *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*. And see above, i, p. 415.

earliest impetus. It was in the literary *coterie* which fostered the lyric of art, the prose romance, and our earliest literary criticism that Seneca found his surest lodgment: that interesting *coterie* of which Sidney and his talented sister, the Countess of Pembroke, were the heart and soul, which entertained hospitably the philosophy of Bruno, and received with acclaim the poetry of Spenser. In 1581 the translation into English of the *Tenne Tragedies* of Seneca was complete. Oxford witnessed a histrionic revival in the Latin plays of Dr. William Gager in the early eighties, Sidney being present with his uncle Leicester, Pembroke, and other of his kinsfolk at the performance of that author's *Meleager* at Christ Church College in 1581.[1] Three years later Hughes, assisted by Master Francis Bacon and other young Templars, was busy, as we have seen, about his presentation before the queen of *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, a Senecan tragedy in English which scarcely marks an advance on *Gorboduc*.[2] And in 1591 came *Tancred and Gismunda*. In short, from the Princess Elizabeth's own Englishings of Seneca before her accession to the throne to the rise of the popularity at court of the comedies of Lyly and long after, Seneca in Latin and English, in translation and in imitation, furnished continuous material for literary exercise and representation to scholar and courtier and to those who followed them from afar. It was in 1591, the year of the earlier draft of *Romeo and Juliet*, that Robert Wilmot, a confirmed Senecan, adjured his *Gismunda* not to "straggle in her plumes abroad, but to contain herself within the walls of your houses

[1] Printed in 1592.

[2] See above, i, pp. 105–107.

[that is, those of the Inner Temple]; so am I sure she shall be safe from the tragedian tyrants of our time." [1] Clearly the scholars and courtiers looked with distrust on these "tragedian tyrants" who laid unlearned and unhallowed hands on even their approved and sacred model of courtly and academic dramatic art.

French Seneca in England.

It was at such a moment as this that Seneca in a new dilution was added to the forces at work on the drama of England. The influence of the contemporary literature of France on that of England in the age of Shakespeare has received less attention than it deserves; and this may be affirmed despite much excellent work involving the greater and more obvious points of contact between the two literatures.[2] It is often less the effect of commanding genius on the greatest men of an age that affords the essence of "comparative literature," than the "complex and compound" of many minor effects which feed drop by drop the current of the time. Such a minor influence was that of the French Senecan Garnier on a small group of the minor dramatists of England during the very height of Shakespeare's contemporary success. And while it cannot but add to our admiration for the versatility of the age that so exotic a plant as Gallicized Seneca should have thriven with the other abundant flora of Elizabethan literature, we are surprised that the conservatism of caste should, even for a time, deliberately have preferred

[1] "To the Gentlemen Students of the Inner Temple," *Tancred and Gismunda*, Dodsley, vii, 15.

[2] See, however, J. A. Lester, *Connections between the Drama of France and Great Britain, particularly in the Elizabethan Period*, MS. Thesis, 1902, Harvard Library.

these outworn modes to the dramatic variety and luxuriance that flourished everywhere about it.

Garnier's Roman tragedies.

Robert Garnier was a follower of Etienne Jodelle, the author, in 1552, of the first regular French tragedy, *Cléopâtre Captive*. In eight tragedies of exceeding popularity, composed between the years 1563 and the time of his tragic death in 1590, Garnier upheld the Senecan ideal of tragedy and deeply affected the course and character of French tragedy to come. Three of Garnier's plays are Roman in theme, *Porcie*, *Cornelie*, and *M. Antoine*.[1] They form a species of trilogy on the Roman civil wars, and are interesting to the student of English drama in that their source, Amyot's *Plutarch*, is the same whence Shakespeare was later to derive (with the further intervention of the English translator, Sir Thomas North), the Roman history of *Cæsar* and *Antony and Cleopatra*. Garnier was the great contemporary tragic writer of France when his influence reached England. And the earlier of the translations of the two of his plays which were done into English was made in the very year of his death.

Garnier's English translators and imitators.

The plays of this later Senecan group begin with two translations of Garnier, the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonie*, written in 1590, and *Cornelia*, Englished by Thomas Kyd a year or two later;[2] to continue in several original plays, the work of Samuel Daniel, Samuel Brandon, and Sir Fulke Greville, and conclude in the *Four Monarchic Tra-*

[1] On this general theme, see J. W. Cunliffe, "Early French Tragedy in the Light of Recent Scholarship," *Journal of Comparative Literature*, i, no. 4, 301; especially 314.

[2] See the ed. of the former by Alice Luce, *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, iii, 1897. An account of the countess is on p. 33.

*gedies* of Sir William Alexander, between 1603 and 1607. A preference for rime, stricter regularity in verse form, the use of elaborate stanzaic forms in the choruses, and the employment of human personages instead of abstractions therein, all have been posited of this group as contrasted with earlier English Seneca.[1] To this may be added the more general characteristics, a greater restraint, and a chaster diction. And yet the two translations employ much blank verse; Brandon, "a practiced poet," as Collier calls him, affects compound words, though not wanting in taste; and Daniel's later play, with both of Greville's, reverts in versification (Greville's likewise in horror and blood) to the earlier English practice of Seneca. None the less these plays assuredly proceed from one and the same literary impulse and are more conspicuously the work of a *coterie* than any other series in our drama. For both Kyd and Daniel, whose first play of the type, *Cleopatra*, was published in 1594, were under the immediate patronage and encouragement of the Countess of Pembroke. And while Kyd's translation is inscribed to the Countess of Sussex, an aunt of Lady Pembroke, Daniel's tragedy is not only dedicated to the Countess of Pembroke, his earliest patron, but is referred specifically to the inspiration of her *Antonie*. Brandon's *Virtuous Octavia* was equally inspired as to subject by the noble lady's translation;[2] and taking up an

[1] M. W. Croll, *The Works of Fulke Greville*, University of Pennsylvania Thesis, 1903, pp. 33–35.

[2] This excessively rare play is accessible only in the Dyce Collection at the South Kensington Museum. The one quarto, 1598, is dedicated to Lady Lucia Audley, and the volume contains two poetical letters of Octavia to Antony in the manner of Drayton's *Heroical Epistles*.

earlier period in the career of Marcus Antonius (that between his departure to the Parthian war and Actium), centers the scene in Rome and the interest in Antony's forsaken wife. Indeed, neither Antony nor Cleopatra appears as a character. This play, although essentially undramatic, is by no means ill conceived or ill written. It holds its own in its class for the polish of its diction and its frequently poetic spirit. There is no record of the performance of *Octavia*, nor of that of *Antonie;* and the ill success of *Cornelia* on the stage prevented Kyd from fulfilling the promise of his dedication and translating Garnier's *Porcie* also.[1] A belated specimen of this same limited group is *The Tragedy of Mariam the Fair Queen of Jewry*, printed in 1613 and the work of Lady Elizabeth Carew. Lady Carew was a kinswoman of Edmund Spenser, and it was to her that he dedicated his *Muiopotmos* in 1590. *Mariam* exhibits no distinctive features above its class, and was doubtless as free as the rest from vulgar contact with any stage.[2] It seems not unreasonable to place the date of the composition of this tragedy in the early nineties.

Samuel Daniel, 1562–1619;

Samuel Daniel was the son of a music master, and was educated at Oxford. A year or two older than Shakespeare, Daniel survived the great dramatist three years. Daniel's career as an author began as early as 1584. His graceful, Italianate sonnets,

[1] Strange to say, no influence of this kind seems traceable in the Latin plays at the universities. French Seneca was aulic, not academic.

[2] Lady Carew's daughter was also named Elizabeth. She later married Sir Thomas Berkeley. It is not altogether certain that she, rather than her mother, may not have been the author of this play. A later play on the same general subject, *Herod and Antipater*, 1622, will receive mention below, p. 35.

*Delia*, were the first to follow in the flowery path already marked out by Sidney's *Astrophel and Stella* and later to be so well trodden; while his *History of the Civil Wars*, one of the several narrative rivals of the chronicle play, retained for years an envied popularity. As a poet Daniel enjoyed a deserved success, and his later pastorals and masques added to his well-earned laurels. But neither in these nor in *Cleopatra*, nor yet in *Philotas*, his other Senecan play, begun in 1600, can Daniel be pronounced a dramatist. A certain queenly and tragic dignity surrounds the figure of his Cleopatra, withdrawn to her tomb and hovering on the brink of an heroic resolution. And unity, tragic decorum, adequacy, at times eloquence of diction, occasional poetic flight and metrical inventiveness in the choruses, all are characteristic of both tragedies. *Philotas* is the better play; and a freer verse, in which Garnier's influence is repudiated, with an approach to more natural dialogue, marks this tragedy as, next to those of Greville, the best of its kind. Two characteristics of *Philotas* disclose Daniel's literary intimacy with Greville. One is the increased importance — and space too, alas! — devoted to abstract moral and political comment and reflection; the other is the curious attitude of the chorus "who," in Daniel's own phrase, "vulgarly (according to their affections, carried rather with compassion on great men's misfortunes, than with the consideration of the cause) frame their imaginations by that square, and censure what is done." [1] With such a treatment as this of the story of Philotas, a popular young noble, full of pride, outspoken in his criticism of his sovereign, Alexander

his two Senecan plays.

[1] *Philotas*, Grosart's *Daniel*, iii, 106.

the Great, and problematically a conspirator, there was little wonder that Daniel was summoned before the Privy Council, and that the tragedy, when printed in 1605, contained an "apology" wherein the allegation that the play darkly shadowed forth the fall of the late Earl of Essex was strenuously if not convincingly denied.[1]

Sir Fulke Greville, 1554–1628.

To Fulke Greville, afterwards Lord Brooke, tragedy was no mere art, much less a frivolous amusement. That deeply interesting man describes himself on his tomb as "servant to Queen Elizabeth, counsellor to King James, Friend to Sir Philip Sidney," and his full and useful life was prolonged from the later years of Mary's reign until King Charles I was well settled on his throne. A close and interested spectator of the classical experiments of the Areopagus, if not a partaker therein, a contemporary witness of Spenser's sheer lift of English poetry to a place of distinction among the literatures of Europe, Greville lived to befriend young Davenant, destined laureate of the Restoration, and into days which heard the first thin pipings of Waller.[2] But it is not the stretch of Greville's years alone which calls for comment, but his curious aloofness from the great and living literature which flourished, almost menacingly, about him. This aloofness Greville shared with Lord Bacon and some others, but in Greville

[1] This "apology" contains mention of a play on the same argument by Dr. Richard Lateware, acted at St. John's College, Oxford, "above eight years since," *i. e.* about 1588. A "comedy of *Philotus*" was printed in Edinburgh in 1603 and again in 1612. Hazlitt, *Handbook*, 458. This curious production, which is written in riming stanzas and is clearly of Italian extraction, was reprinted for the Bannatyne Club, 1835.

[2] *Poems of Waller*, ed. Drury, 1893, p. lxxiv.

it is the less explicable in that he flashes forth at times in genuine poetry of a rare and strange originality. Greville's earliest associations bound him to the Sidneys and Pembrokes; his plays were written, as external evidence as well as their form and nature attest, in literary intimacy with Daniel. And one of them, his *Antony and Cleopatra*, that it might not be "construed or strained," like Daniel's *Philotas*, into a commentary on the passing events of Essex's conspiracy, suffered execution by fire, in 1601, at the hands of its cautious author.[1]

Greville's *Alaham*, c. 1600; *Mustapha*, c. 1606.

*Alaham* and *Mustapha* remain the two extant plays of Greville. The latter was surreptitiously printed in 1609; *Alaham* first appeared in the posthumous folio of Lord Brooke's *Works* in 1633. It seems likely that *Alaham* is the earlier, and dates prior to 1600. *Mustapha* could scarcely have been written later than the earlier years of the reign of King James. The source of *Mustapha* has been traced to De Thou, *Historia sui Temporis* or (perhaps preferably) to Georgievitz's *De Turcarum Moribus*, a translation of which, entitled *The Offspring of the House of the Ottomans*, had been made into English by H. Goughe as early as 1570.[2] But it seems not unlikely that here, as in the case of Chapman with Grimestone, Greville sought a source more easily accessible in Knolles' *General History of the Turks*, first published in 1603.[3] *Alaham* is original, if sug-

[1] Greville's *Life of Sidney*, ed. 1652, p. 178.

[2] See the discussion of this subject in the excellent monograph of Dr. Croll on Greville, mentioned above, 36–38. This source had been employed in the drama before, in the Latin *Solymannidæ Tragœdia*, 1581.

[3] See ed. 1638, pp. 757–763.

gestive in situations of the *Antigone*, of *Œdipus Coloneus*, and other classical reading. The scene is Ormus; and the play relates the plot of Alaham to wrest the throne from his aged father and his upright elder brother, his cruel execution of them by fire, and his own death by a poisoned coronation robe, the gift of his wife, whose paramour he had slain. An exquisite conception of devoted womanhood is that of the king's daughter, Cælica, who, like another Antigone, resists "wicked intrenched authority," and leads forth her wronged and blinded father to sanctuary in an ancient tomb. In *Mustapha*, the loyal and magnanimous Turkish prince of that name falls a victim to the machinations of Rossa, the Sultana, his stepmother, and the credulous suspiciousness of the Sultan; while Rossa's malevolent ambition for her own pitiful son is foiled in the moment of achievement by his untimely suicide.

The theory of Greville's tragedies.

But neither questions of source nor of plot mark the actual interest of these curious and exceedingly original plays. This consists rather in the unusual theory in which they were conceived and in the surprising circumstance that literature of so high an order should have proved the outcome of conditions so untoward. Writing of these plays, Greville says: "My purpose in them was, not (with the ancient) to exemplifie the disasterous miseries of mans life, where order, lawes, doctrine and authority are unable to protect inocency from exorbitant wickednesse of power, and so out of that melancholick vision stir horrour, or murmur against Divine Providence: nor yet (with the modern) to point out Gods revenging aspect upon every particular sin, to the despaire, or confusion of mortality; but rather to trace out the

high waies of ambitious governours, and to shew in the practice, that the more audacity, advantage, and good success such soveraignties have, the more they hasten to their owne desolation and ruine."[1] To quote the admirable summary of the most recent student of Greville: "'The high waies of ambitious governours' form the main subject of the tragedies, but the folly of human desires would more nearly indicate the scope of their thought. The plans of the two plays are very similar. In each a weak tyrant occupies the throne, and . . . the most dangerous plotter is a woman who tries to alter the succession in the interest of her own son. In each there is a representative of the organized church, and two representatives of the faults of the nobility, and a daughter of the wronged king, whose virtues are a foil to the mad vices of the other women of the play. Finally there is one good man in each, a counselor of state. . . . He takes no part in the strife, and belongs to no party; he argues that the evils of the time offer no latitude for noble action, and finds his duty in 'bearing nobly.' It is he who reports the rising of the people at the end of the play (*Mustapha*) and debates the significant question whether duty is on the side of obedience to authority or on the side of rebellion — with the conclusion that both are forms of folly and that the only wisdom is patience. He is a kind of Seneca, a representative of the Stoic wisdom, and clearly the projection of the author's own moral philosophy." And further: "It is apparent that Greville's plays are intellectual in a different sense from all the other plays of the time. Daniel and Sir William Alexander induce abstract morality

[1] *Life of Sidney*, 242.

and philosophy from the particular cases they consider; Greville deduces character and all but the main outlines of the story from abstract thought. Greville's are therefore philosophical dramas in the exact sense, in the same sense in which Goethe's *Faust* and Browning's *Sordello* are philosophical, and it follows that they must be criticised in a different way from the other plays in the same form. We may wonder at other poets of the Elizabethan age who from no other motive than literary snobbishness preferred the outgrown Senecan form to the living drama of their day, but we cannot object to the use of such a form for the drama of philosophy. The fact that it is fixed in the mould of honorable disuse is its qualification for this service." [1]

Sir William Alexander, 1580–1640; his *Monarchic Tragedies*, 1603–07.

Sir William Alexander of Menstrie, afterwards Earl of Sterling, was one of the many Scottish gentry who followed the fortunes of their sovereign into England. Alexander's political career and later unpopularity in the country of his birth, when he "held the seals as Secretary for Scotland," do not concern us here. His *Four Monarchic Tragedies* comprise *Darius*, *Crœsus*, *Julius Cæsar*, and *The Alexandræan Tragedy*. This last, which is the most elaborate, details "the contentions of the Diadochi down to the murder of the royal family of Macedon." *Darius* was written before the accession of King James to the English throne, and the other tragedies

[1] Croll, 41. A preposterous product of would-be intellectualized poetry is *Cynthia's Revenge or Mœnander's Extasy* by one John Stephens, published first anonymously in 1613. Here unite the obscurity of Greville, Jonson's allegory at its hardest, and Marston's bombast and impertinence, with a dullness and incoherence, Stephens' own. *Cynthia's Revenge* may be pronounced English Seneca run mad and the most intolerable of Elizabethan plays.

soon followed. An independent influence of the French Senecans on Alexander has been surmised; [1] but it seems more likely that his immediate model was Daniel, whose position as the acknowledged court poet succeeding Spenser could not but have impressed the northern aspirant for English honors, literary and other. Alexander's *Aurora* in the sonnet fashion of the past decade seems to attest a similar influence. *The Monarchic Tragedies* preserve, in their employment of rime and in the elaborate stanzas of the choruses, the narrower traditions of French Seneca; and they exaggerate, if anything, these traditions in their wholly epic quality and in their prolixity and wordiness. These productions are purely literary, and thus are at the farthest remove from genuine and actable drama. They mark, in a word, the absorption of the influence of Seneca in its strictness in the drama of their time.

French Seneca inspired by Senecan form.

In the group of plays just examined the method was more or less strictly classical, involving not only "exact and careful form," a predominance of "moral over romantic interest," and simplicity in plot and situation, but likewise the apparatus of ancient drama: the employment of the chorus for lyrical — more commonly gnomic — comment on the course of the play, the use of the messenger to supply by epic recital large parts of the action, the use of *stichomythia* or word contest in dialogue of parallel construction, and other such particulars.[2] In a word, Daniel and his confrères, like Sackville and Hughes, retained more especially the form with that which

[1] See Ward, ii, 626, note, where a *Darius* of the brothers La Taille and a *Mort de César* by Grévin are mentioned.

[2] Saintsbury in Grosart's *Daniel*, iii, p. ix.

was conservative in Seneca. It was Seneca's differences and departures, on the other hand, from the usages of ancient drama, his sensationalism, melodrama, and grandiloquence, that most permanently affected the popular stage from Kyd to Marston.

Early popular plays on classical subjects.

Let us now turn to the far larger class of Elizabethan tragedies in which the stories of ancient times are staged with varying degrees of that greater freedom in the manipulation of dramatic material which had come to prevail on the popular stage.[1] Neither classification by subject-matter nor the minuter details of style and treatment can wholly serve us here. None the less, a general historical interest and a handling of material in a manner not unlike that which we have seen in the chronicle history distinguishes a certain number of these plays. In others, such as *Troilus and Cressida* or *The Roman Actor*, a substituted satirical or romantic interest effaces all semblance to any foundation in classical story;[2] while in many more the choice of subject is without question wholly accidental. We may pass by the moralities based on stories derived from ancient history, such as Preston's popular *Cambises* and Richard Bower's *Appius and Virginia*, both of which were acted before Shakespeare's birth and have already been mentioned.[3] The epic spirit of the chronicle play was early turned in the direction of ancient history in plays such as Thomas Lodge's *Wounds*

*The Wounds of the Civil Wars, c.* 1588.

[1] Seneca popularized has already been considered above, i, pp. 98, 136, 556, 557.

[2] For example, Bond (*Lyly*, ii, 251) claims *Campaspe* as "the first historical play," but *Campaspe* is romantic, not historical.

[3] See above, i, p. 120; *The Queen of Ethiopia* was acted at Bristol in 1578. Fleay, ii, 291.

*of the Civil Wars* and in the anonymous *Wars of Cyrus*, both dating close to the outburst of English chronicle history about 1588. Lodge's play, which treats of the struggle of Marius and Sulla for the dictatorship of Rome, is the earliest extant play in English on a Roman subject, although the titles of several plays now lost, among them a "*Julyus Sesar*" of 1562, a *Pompey* of 1580, and a *Sylla Dictator* of 1588 precede.[1] North's *Plutarch*, Shakespeare's familiar source for Roman history, is here broached for the first time. But little praise can be accorded to Lodge's tragedy, which, though written with the easy and forcible diction which that ready pamphleteer could almost always command, is a bare succession of scenes, marred by comic parts which are alike crude in themselves and ill-placed. Sulla's triumphant entry into Rome, drawn by four Moors, discloses the close proximity of this play to Marlowe's bombastic scene in which victorious Tamburlaine is similarly drawn in triumph on the stage by the four captive kings of Asia.[2] The broken French of the Gaul, Pedro, is an amusing though by no means glaring anachronism for the period of this unformed play. *The Wars of Cyrus, against Antiochus, with the Tragical End of Panthea*, is an abler production. The events which it sets forth are interesting in themselves and well handled in blank verse unusually free for its time. Cyrus the conqueror's relations to Panthea, his fair captive, are much those of Alexander

*The Wars of Cyrus*, *c.* 1588.

[1] A *Marcus Geminus*, 1566, and Geddes' *Cæsar*, 1582, seem the only Latin plays on Roman history which preceded Lodge's *Wounds*. A *Mamillia* is mentioned in the *Revels' Accounts*, in 1573.

[2] *Wounds of the Civil Wars*, III, i; 2 *Tamburlaine*, IV, iv.

and Campaspe in Lyly's well-known contemporary play; but *Cyrus*, in its popular representation of an episode in the career of the great king, links on to the conqueror series and follows, in the main, the method of the chronicle play.[1] An examination of Henslowe's book and other sources for the few succeeding years discloses several titles which must have applied to historical dramas of much the type of these, ranging from *Ninus and Semiramis, the First Monarchs of the World*, to *Diocletian, Zenobia, Heliogabalus, Phocas*, and *Julian Apostata*.[2] A special interest attaches to the tragedy of *Dido*, the work of Marlowe and Thomas Nash, which, although published likewise in 1594, has been thought by some to be an early work of these poets before their departure from Cambridge.[3] The subject may have been suggested by a Latin play, either that of Halliwell acted before the queen at King's College, Cambridge, the university of Marlowe and Nash, in 1564, or by the more recent *Dido* of Dr. Gager, performed at Christ Church, Oxford, in 1583. Both of these plays remain extant; an earlier school drama, also founded on Vergil's story and acted before Cardinal Wolsey in 1532, has perished.[4] *The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage*,

*Dido* by Marlowe and Nash, pr. 1594.

[1] See the reprint of this play by Keller, *Jahrbuch*, xxxvii, 1.

[2] Henslowe, 13, 20, 30; S. R. June, 1594, May, 1595.

[3] Fleay, ii, 147.

[4] This earliest *Dido* was acted at St. Paul's School under conduct of John Rightwise. Halliwell's is described in Nicholas Robinson's account of the queen's visit to Cambridge in 1564, as "*Virgilianus versibus maxima ex parte compositum.*" See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 186. An extract from Gager's play is contained in Dyce's *Marlowe*, appendix. Henslowe (p. 83) mentions a *Dido and Æneas* in January, 1598, which Collier (iii, 94) thought a revival of Marlowe and Nash's tragedy, but which Fleay, ii, 306,

by Marlowe and Nash, is a favorable and well-compacted specimen of epic narrative converted into drama; and while wanting the power as well as the poetry of the greater works of Marlowe, is not unworthy association with his name. The excellence of its construction and the smoothness of its blank verse argue against a date for its composition prior to *Tamburlaine* and *The Jew of Malta*.[1] *Dido* is as free from the prevailing Senecan traits as from the bombast and rant of the conqueror plays and the tragedy of revenge.[2]

Heywood's dramatized mythology, 1595–96.

The habitual confusion of history and myth in the age of Elizabeth has been frequently mentioned in the course of this work, and we have met with the myths of ancient Greece and Rome not only in plays written under direct classical influence, but in the graceful allegorical court dramas and entertainments of Lyly, Peele, and others as well. The nineties witnessed a novel if rough and uncouth popularization of classical mythology on the London stage in a series of medley dramas, the work of that versatile and productive playwright, Thomas Heywood. *The Golden*, *Silver*, and *Brazen Age* constitute together three plays of considerable length in which the author, so to speak, sat down with a copy of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* at his left hand, and translated the text into English dialogue with his right, omitting little and extenuating nothing. *The Golden Age*

regards as Jonson's work, promised the preceding Christmas (Henslowe, 82), and quoted in part in *Hamlet*, II, ii, 472–541. There is a mention, too, of a *Dido and Æneas*, an interlude performed at Chester. Hazlitt, *Manual*, 64.

[1] Fleay, ii, 147.

[2] For *Titus Andronicus*, the affiliations of which are wholly unclassical, see above, v, 33.

contains "the lives of Jupiter and Saturn with the deifying of the heathen gods." [1] *The Silver Age* proceeds to "the fortunes of Perseus, the love of Jupiter and Alcmena, the birth of Hercules, the rape of Proserpina, and the arraignment of the Moon;" and *The Brazen Age* unites the death of Nessus, the tragedies of Meleager and Jason with Vulcan's net, and the labors of Hercules.[2] Homer is the presenter of this panorama of mythology, which is enlivened as it runs by the old-fashioned device of dumb shows. In two of these extraordinary productions the persons of the drama change completely five times. And yet a surprising dramatic vitality pervades some of these sketchy scenes and in part at least accounts for their reported popularity. The two plays on *The Iron Age* soon followed. In them Heywood tells of the siege of Troy, using Lydgate's *Destruction of Troy* much as he had previously employed Ovid. We have thus five plays of this species. And although their publication was strung out from 1611 to 1632, their identification under various titles with entries of Henslowe's for the Admiral's men running from March, 1594, to the following June seems all but certain.[3] Although no other play of this particular type remains extant, it seems not unreasonable to suppose that the later activity of Chettle and Dekker in work such as *Troy's Revenge with the Tragedy of Polyphemus* (plainly the wanderings of Ulysses),

[1] Perhaps originally *Seleo* (*Cælo*) *and Olympo*, acted at the Rose, March, 1595. Henslowe, 22.

[2] Two plays on Hercules were acted at the Rose in May, 1595; *ibid.* 22, 24. But see *ibid.* 86, where Martin Slather was paid for these, *Phocas*, *Pythagoras*, and *Alexander and Lodowick*. Ward, ii, 608, regards Slather or Slater as their author.

[3] Fleay, i, 283–286.

*Troilus and Cressida*, *Agamemnon*, "*Orestes furies*," and *Damon and Pythias*, all in 1599 and 1600, may have been much of this type.[1] Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece* belongs to another group.[2]

Plays on Julius Cæsar.

Thus when, in 1601, Shakespeare set forth his *Julius Cæsar* on the stage, we meet once more with his usual practice: the seizure on a variety of drama already tried in the popular taste, with a glorification of it by the strength of his genius to a position above its class. *Julius Cæsar* recurs for material to North's *Plutarch*, a source, as we have seen, already employed by Lodge. The tragedy on its surface is a chronicle history on the death of Cæsar and the events subsequent. The subject had been frequently used for drama before. "The furst day of Feybruary at nyght," 1562, witnessed "*Julyus Sesar* played" at court, "the earliest instance," Collier declares, "of a subject from Roman history being brought upon the stage." [3] A *Cæsar and Pompey* was mentioned in 1580 by Gosson, and is doubtless the same with "*a storie of pompie*" acted before the queen on Twelfth Night of that year, "whereon was ymploied newe, one great citty, a senate howse and eight ells of dobble sarcenet for curtens." [4] Two years later a Latin *Julius Cæsar* was acted at Christ Church College, Oxford, the work of Dr. Richard Geddes

[1] Henslowe, 30, 57, 102, 104, 109. Malone records a *Sardanapalus* of 1603, *Variorum Shakespeare*, iii, 509. Other titles of Henslowe, 27, 60, 90, 118, are *Pythagoras*, 1596; *Hannibal and Hermes*, 1598; and *Jugurtha*, and *The Golden Ass*, 1600, and *Hannibal and Scipio*, 1601.

[2] See below, p. 27.

[3] Collier, i, 180.

[4] *Plays Confuted*, 1581, p. 188; Malone, iii, 304 n.; and *Revels' Accounts*, 167.

or Eades, chaplain to Queen Elizabeth.[1] In November, 1594, Henslowe records a "*seser and pompie*" as acted by the Admiral's men at the Rose, followed by a "2 *pte* (*part*) *of sesore*" in June, 1595.[2] None of these predecessors of Shakespeare's tragedy is extant, but their distribution in point of time, at court, at Oxford, and on the London boards, is significant of the wide popularity of the life of the greatest man of antiquity as a tragic topic for dramatic art. That Shakespeare's *Cæsar* gave a new vogue to the subject is proved by Henslowe's record in 1602, of a "*sesers ffalle*," consummated by the joint efforts of Munday, Drayton, Webster, Middleton, "and the rest;"[3] by Sir William Alexander's "monarchicke" tragedy, 1607; by Chapman's *Cæsar and Pompey*, somewhat later; and by the anonymous drama of the same title bearing date 1607. Chapman's tragedy is far less effective and scholarly than might have been expected of the translator of Homer; and he records with apparent satisfaction that his play "yet never toucht it at the stage," that is, was never acted.[4] The anonymous *Tragedy of Cæsar and Pompey or Cæsar's Revenge* is a college drama showing reminiscence of popular Seneca in its chorus, the abstraction Discord, and in the treatment of the ghost of Cæsar. This and the primitive quality of its blank verse induced Craik long ago to identify it with Henslowe's "*seser and pompie*" of 1594.[5] Finally, the manuscript of a Latin *Julius Cæsar* by Thomas May is still extant, and may be identical with a late

[1] Fleay, i, 162, 244. [2] Henslowe, 20, 24.
[3] Henslowe, 166.
[4] Dedication, *Chapman's Works*, ed. 1873, iii, 125.
[5] G. L. Craik, *English of Shakespeare*, 47; and Henslowe, 20.

*Julius Cæsar*, acted privately by students of Trinity College, Oxford, it is not recorded when.

To return to Shakespeare's play, it has often been remarked that the title is a misnomer. Cæsar is presented only in his decline. It is his arrogance, vacillation, and superstition, his physical weakness and defects of temper, that are dwelt on and emphasized, and not his greatness. While Brutus, visionary idealist that he is and fatally attended by error in all his political acts, is generous, large of soul, and truly heroic. This contrast is further heightened by that existing between Brutus and Cassius, that keen but not ignoble politician. Cæsar falls in the climax, not in the catastrophe; and the play prosecutes the events which followed his death to the Nemesis which overtook the conspirators against him. This has given rise to the ingenious theory that *Julius Cæsar* originally constituted a double play such as *Antonio and Mellida* with the following *Antonio's Revenge*, or the tragedies concerning the brothers D'Ambois. It has further been surmised that the two plays were perhaps known as *The Tragedy* and *The Revenge of Julius Cæsar*, and that they were later thrown into one under stress of some unknown theatrical exigency.[1] Without passing judgment on this theory, it may be noticed that an acceptance of it links *Cæsar* with the series of tragedies of revenge, already discussed, with which Shakespeare's tragedy synchronizes, although absolutely repugnant to their pervading qualities of blood, terror, and melodrama. *Julius Cæsar* is one of the most regularly constructed of the tragedies of Shakespeare, excelling greater plays in the uniform adequacy of its diction

Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar*, 1601.

[1] Fleay, ii, 185; and his *Life of Shakespeare*, 214.

and in the evenness and finish of its workmanship. Essentially ornate although the art of Shakespeare is, in this tragedy he seems to have caught by inspiration the atmosphere of dignity and restraint which we habitually associate with the republic of ancient Rome: and this even although his picture is made up at times of details open to stricture at the hands of the classical purist and specialist in archæology.

*Sejanus, his Fall*, 1603.

There seems some reason to surmise that Jonson's *Sejanus, his Fall*, first acted in 1603, was deliberately planned and written in emulation of the success of Shakespeare's *Cæsar*, and in scholarly protest against the want of perspective and carelessness as to historical accuracy which characterized the handling of classical subjects on the popular stage. Jonson was one of the few dramatists of his day in whom any sense of incongruity could have been stirred by the striking of the clock in Brutus' orchard, or by the pistol which Demetrius Poliorcetes presents at the head of an intruder in one of Fletcher's plays.[1] And Jonson was absolutely the only literary man in England to resent such anachronisms and improprieties. At the same time it is easy to attach too much importance to these Elizabethan dramatic rivalries; and a passage in the address "To the Reader" of the quarto of *Sejanus*, 1605, further complicates the subject. This passage informs us that "this book, in all numbers, is not the same with that which was acted on the public stage; wherein a second pen had good share: in place of which, I have rather chosen to put weaker and, no doubt, less pleasing,

[1] *Cæsar*, II, i, 191; *The Humorous Lieutenant*, IV, iv; cf. also the similar anachronism in *Pericles*, I, i, 168.

of mine own, than to defraud so happy a genius of his right by my loathed usurpation." [1] Whalley suggested Shakespeare's as "the second pen;" [2] and Fleay upholds this notion in a modified form,[3] though Gifford asked "might not Chapman or Middleton be intended here?" [4] Whatever may be the truth of these matters, it was the King's company that performed *Sejanus;* and we know that Shakespeare himself acted a part.[5] Two such men as Shakespeare and Jonson could afford to be generous in their personal relations; and such all the evidence at our disposal proves them to have been. The only scrap of Jonson's criticism of Shakespeare's Roman dramas that remains concerns a trivial speech of Cæsar's, not in the play as we now have it.[6] What Shakespeare thought of the tragedy in which he acted is buried with his inward thoughts of his own great works.

*Sejanus* was not a popular success, although appreciated and approved by "the judicious." When his tragedy was published, a year later, Jonson characteristically cited line and chapter in footnotes to avouch the accuracy of his classical lore, a practice impertinent in such a work to the learned and an affront to the unlettered.[7] This and his habitual

*Sejanus*, a consummate study in classical portraiture.

[1] Gifford, *Jonson*, iii, 6.

[2] Whalley, *Jonson*, i, p. xl.

[3] Fleay, *Shakespeare*, 50; the notion being that Shakespeare altered only the rôle in which he acted.

[4] Gifford, *Jonson*, iii, 7 n. Neither of these poets was writing for the King's company, which acted *Sejanus* in 1603.

[5] See the list of actors affixed to *Sejanus* in the folios of 1616 and 1640.

[6] *Discoveries* of Jonson, ed. Schelling, 1892, p. 23.

[7] See the prudent words of Jonson on this topic in the address prefixed to the quarto of 1605, in which he expresses his honest

attitude of aggression long obscured to the critics the superlative excellence of this master-tragedy of Jonson's, which contains one of the most consummate dramatic studies of historical character to be found in the annals of literature. It would be impossible to overpraise the success with which the Elizabethan dramatist has transferred the subtle and enigmatic features of the Tiberius of Tacitus to scenes instinct with the very life of imperial Rome. The heroic stoicism of Brutus, the sharp acquisitiveness of Cassius; Antony, careless and pleasure-loving, yet master of a natural eloquence that raised the stones of Rome to mutiny,—these are men drawn to the life as Jonson could never have drawn them. But if the scholarly reader would see ancient Rome, her "very form and pressure," hear such speech as Romans might have uttered, and see the life of forum, atrium, and senate chamber, let him turn to *Sejanus* or to *Catiline*, not to *Cæsar* or *Coriolanus*. None the less, it must be confessed that Marston echoed a prevalent opinion and one justified in the event, when he wrote in the preface to his *Tragedy of Sophonisba*, which followed *Sejanus* closely: "Know, that I have not laboured in this poem to tie myself to relate any thing as an historian, but to enlarge every thing as a poet. To transcribe authors, quote authorities, and translate Latine prose orations into English blank verse, hath, in this subject, been the least aim of my studies."[1] The last words are unjust to Jonson and betray sheer malice; and yet the power "to enlarge every

abhorrence of pedantry and justifies such quotation to show his "integrity in the story," Gifford, *Jonson*, iii, 6.

[1] Bullen's *Marston*, ii, 235.

thing as a poet," that divine spontaneity that comes not of study nor with prayer, was the one thing denied the author of *Sejanus*, a thing altogether priceless and the making of many a playwright of half the talent of Jonson.

*Sophonisba*, 1603.

Marston went to Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* for the source of his *Wonder of Women or the Tragedy of Sophonisba*, which is accordingly pseudo-historical and romantic, and at the very opposite pole from *Sejanus* in ideal, conduct, and method. There is a fine heroic touch in the conception of Sophonisba and her husband, Massinissa, which points forward to the coming vogue of "romance." This tragedy, which runs much more clearly and swiftly than is the wont of the dramatic current of Marston, deserves a better repute than the critics have given it.[1]

Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, 1603.

Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece*, acted in 1603 as well, is a ready but commonplace refashioning of an immortal story, inexplicably destroyed in its tragic and pathetic possibilities by the intrusion of the songs — some as ribald as others are exquisite — of "the merry Lord Valerius." Popularization could go no farther than this.

Contemporary classical tragedies at the universities.

Nor was the popular stage alone in its choice of subjects from Roman history.[2] As early as 1566 a play dealing with the revolt of the slaves in the reign of Alexander Severus and called *Marcus Geminus* was acted before Queen Elizabeth at Oxford, and various *Cæsars*, *Neros*, and *Catilines* followed, besides

[1] Nabbes' *Hannibal and Scipio*, acted in 1635, treats of much the same subject and not unworthily.

[2] *Perfidius Hetruscus*, described in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 250, is scarcely historical. On the college drama of this type, see below, p. 59.

a *Caracalla* and an *Andronicus Comnenus* of uncertain dates.[1] The typical play of this group is Dr. Matthew Gwinne's *Nero Tragœdia Nova*, printed in 1603 and dedicated to the queen. This elaborate and ambitious work treats of the whole life of Nero, and its *dramatis personae* extend to eighty-two characters. Gwinne was a successful physician of the day, and the author likewise of a Latin comedy entitled *Vertumnus sive Annus Recurrens*, acted before King James in 1605, on the occasion of his visit to Oxford. It is to this play that the Latin verses are attached which from their mention of Banquo, the thane of "Loquabria" and the royal line descended from his loins, gave rise to the notion of Farmer that here was the source of *Macbeth*.[2] The relation of Gwinne's *Nero* — which, as the title informs us, was "*collecta a Tacito, Suetonio, Dione, Seneca*" — to Jonson's *Sejanus* might be worth an investigation. *Nero* certainly preceded *Sejanus*, and its student's use of material, its conscious scholarship and painstaking elaboration are all of them qualities of Jonson's tragedy.

Shakespeare's later plays on classical subjects.

The year 1607 witnessed a revival of interest in classical subjects for tragedy. For besides an English college play on Nero (alike distinguishable from Gwinne's Latin *Nero* of 1603 and from the splendid anonymous English tragedy of 1624), and besides the two plays on Cæsar and Pompey (the one anonymous, the other by Chapman and mentioned above), we find Shakespeare once more turning to classical

[1] An earlier *Play concerning Lucrece* is assigned to 1490 and to the authorship of Henry Medwell. "The heroine," says Chambers (ii, 458), "is not Shakespeare's Lucrece."

[2] *On the Learning of Shakespeare*, ed. 1767, p. 56.

story. Between 1606 and 1610 *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, *Timon of Athens*, *Pericles*, and *Cymbeline* followed in quick succession, whatever their actual order; and some would have us believe that *Troilus and Cressida* (in revision at least) belonged likewise to these years. Be this as it may, that sinister drama of disenchantment has already sufficiently claimed our attention; and *Antony and Cleopatra* has found its place in our discussion of romantic tragedy.[1] *Coriolanus*, like *Cæsar*, is a glorified chronicle history set in the scene of ancient Rome. And there is a symmetry of construction and a uniformity of excellence, too, about the later tragedy that has caused at least one critic, a German, to rank it second to none of its author's works.[2] Neither the conservative critic nor the true appreciator of Shakespeare can assign to *Coriolanus* any such position, despite the vividness and consistency of the conception of the rash and insolent hero, the stately Roman matrons, Volumnia, Virgilia, and Valeria, and the honorable and humorous Menenius. Here, even more pronouncedly than in *Cæsar* and elsewhere, have we Shakespeare's contemptuous attitude towards the mob, which he regards as a thing utterly thoughtless, fickle, and imbecile, an attitude concerning which much nonsense has been written, but which is only that of the Elizabethan drama at large.[3] And when all has been said, the crowd, the mob, can never become a dramatic entity. In the drama, as in life, it is either the tame beast led, or the ravening

*Coriolanus*, 1608 or 1609.

[1] See above, i, pp. 572–574.

[2] H. Viehoff, "Shakespeare's Coriolan," *Jahrbuch*, iv.

[3] Cf. *Alchemist*, v, i; *Philaster*, v, iv; *Julius Cæsar*, iii, ii; *Coriolanus*, i, i; ii, iii.

brute that has broken bands. And one need neither assume the haughty pose of Coriolanus nor posture as a follower of Nordau to recognize the essential truth of the Shakespearean *turba*, from Jack Cade's raw levies to the play before us. Unflagging in the kindliness and fidelity with which he drew the individual man, however simple, lowly, dull, or uncouth, Shakespeare stopped short of a brute-worship of the multitude, a dangerous aberration from the teachings of experience, reserved for the sentimentalist and the pseudo-humanitarian of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

*Timon of Athens* and *Pericles*, c. 1607;

In *Timon of Athens* and *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, Shakespeare leaves purely classical subjects, though still on the skirts of the ancient world. The story of Timon the misanthrope is found in that ancient quarry, *The Palace of Pleasure*, although it forms as well an excursus in Plutarch's *Life of Antonius*, where Shakespeare may well have found it while at work on *Antony and Cleopatra*. *Pericles* is based on the medieval tale of *Apollonius of Tyre*, told in the *Gesta Romanorum*, by Gower and — nearest in point of date to the play — by Laurence Twine in his *Pattern of Painful Adventures*, 1606.[1] Both plays, as we have them, may not impossibly have been remodeled on earlier dramatic productions, although the extant academic *Timon of Athens* of 1600 is not Shakespeare's original, and the earlier *Pericles* survives, if at all, only in parts of the play that we possess. The history of these two plays is a quicksand of conjecture in which little is certain save that *Timon* appeared in the first folio, while *Pericles*,

[1] On the story at large, see *Shakespeare's Pericles and Apollonius of Tyre*, by A. H. Smyth, 1898.

although exceedingly popular and several times published in quarto, was finally included among Shakespeare's works only in the third folio, 1664.[1] It is inconceivable that Shakespeare wrote all of these two dramas with their inequalities of diction, lack of accordance with a general design, and other striking defects. George Wilkins, author of *The Miseries of Enforced Marriage* and a collaborator with Day and William Rowley, has been supposed Shakespeare's co-author in *Pericles* or the completer of his unfinished work; and Rowley, too, has been surmised to have had his hand in this play as well.[2] For *Timon* the collaborator is unnamed except by Mr. Fleay, whose hazardous conjecture of the name of Cyril Tourneur must stand or fall by the critic's metrical tests: for foundation it can have none other.[3] We may leave these intricacies to turn to the plays. In both of them — and especially in *Pericles* — there is noble portraiture and many a passage worthy the genius of the great name with which they have been associated, together with much that we could wish forever separated from Shakespeare. Have we not here once more an example of the total absorption of Shakespeare's attention in character, with his negligence of story, plot, and all else? Timon, who had magnificently proved the world and found it false, digging his roots, and dying in raging hatred of mankind; Pericles, subject to a lifelong sorrow, reclaimed

their dubious authorship.

Shakespeare's negligence of plot and interest in character.

[1] On the bibliographical relations of these plays to the first folio, see Sidney Lee, Introduction to the facsimile reproduction of that book, 1902, pp. xvi and xxviii.

[2] Lee, *Shakespeare*, 252.

[3] *Shakespeare Manual*, 195. It is fair to Mr. Fleay to state that neither in his *Life of Shakespeare*, nor his *Biographical Chronicle of the Drama* does he repeat this opinion.

as by miracle to happiness when hope had long been given over; fresh, charming Marina, preserving the fragrance of innocent maidenhood in the very jungles and morasses of the world,—these are the things that interested our greatest dramatist; not the small plottings of petty and corrupt Italian courts and the dainty episodes of pastoral art. The story might stand as it was in all its shapelessness and improbability —and what could be more shapeless and unlikely than the tale of *Pericles?* But why clear away the chips when the statue stands in its finished glory? The chippings are but dead material: the statue alone lives. And once more, after *Othello*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Antony and Cleopatra* may there not well have been a flagging even in that great spirit, a giant swoop earthward to mount again with strengthened pinion in the ultimate flights of *Cymbeline*, *Winter's Tale*, and *Tempest?*

*Catiline his Conspiracy, 1611.*

In 1611 Jonson's *Catiline, his Conspiracy*, was acted by the King's players, and although only measurably successful at first, was later to enjoy a greater repute than *Sejanus*. Catiline's conspiracy, so succinctly told by Sallust, had already attracted the attention of English dramatic writers. Before 1579 Stephen Gosson had written a play on the theme;[1] and he was followed in 1598 by "a boocke called cattelanes consperesey," the joint production of Wilson and Chettle.[2] Both are lost. A Latin *Catilina Triumphans* is yet extant in manuscript.[3] Jonson

[1] *School of Abuse*, 1579, *Shakespeare Society*, 1841, p. 30, where he describes this play, as "a pig of mine owne sowe."

[2] Henslowe, 94; see, also, Lodge's mention, *Defense of Plays*, *Shakespeare Society*, 1853, p. 28.

[3] In Trinity College Library, Cambridge. Hazlitt, *Manual*, 36.

cared little for such previous attempts, but went direct to Sallust and Cicero, as in *Sejanus;* although in publication he was careful not to repeat the pedantry of his citation of authority, which had been so severely criticised before. *Catiline* is an historical tragedy of exceptionable merit; save for the fortuitous interest which the problem of the character of Tiberius excites in *Sejanus*, the later must be pronounced the superior play. Consummate is the portraiture of conspirators — braggart Cethegus; Lentulus, voluptuary and dreamer; savage and desperate Catiline; and skillful is the contrast of these with prudent Cato and with Cicero, eloquent to the verge of garrulity and appreciative of his own abilities and achievements to a point that halts just short of comedy. But if Jonson's fidelity to the greater portraits of history is worthy of praise, not less admirable is the effect which he has contrived to produce in representing to us, with a vividness which only the stage can attain, the social life of ancient Rome. The scenes in which figure the fickle, wanton Fulvia, and Sempronia, vain of her knowledge of Greek and ambitious to be dabbling in politics, are second to nothing in the satirical high comedy that the age has left us.[1]

Jonson in classical tragedy.

But there is yet another aspect in which Jonson's later Roman tragedy deserves serious attention. *Catiline* is alike the final expression of Jonson's theories as to English tragedy and one of the most successful among English tragedies modeled on ancient dramatic theories and ideals. For although Jonson, be it reaffirmed, was no supine classicist, but believed, to use his own words, that "we should enjoy the same

[1] *Catiline*, especially IV, i.

license or free power to illustrate and heighten our invention as the ancients did; and not be tied to those strict and regular forms, which the niceness of a few — who are nothing but form — would thrust upon us;" [1] yet *Catiline* shows, as compared with *Sejanus*, a retrogression to earlier ideals and a stricter regard for the minor practices if not the larger spirit of Seneca. Thus the drama opens with an Induction in which figures the ghost of Sylla; and lyrical choruses in a variety of metres interlard the acts. But these, as Gifford put it, are "spoken by no one, and addressed to no one," [2] and, although at times of great literary excellence, are absolutely inorganic. *Catiline* with its historical portraiture, its consummate dramatic dialogue and constructive excellence, is no Senecan drama. That Jonson should have fallen short of absolute success in these Roman tragedies of his mature years is wholly due neither to the defects in his theory nor to his limitations as an author. The trend of the age was against such art, as the trend of our age is against it. And when Swinburne dubs *Sejanus* "a magnificent mistake" and esteems *Catiline* as valuable alone for its proof "that Jonson could do better, but not much better, on the same rigid lines," with due respect for the superlative critical powers of a great poet, we must keep in mind that we have rhapsodic and impressionistic art for the nonce arrayed in judicial robes and sitting in judgment on all, in short, that it is not.[3]

*The Tragedy of Nero*, 1624.

But one other play of merit respected to the full the Jonsonian regard for antiquity in its endeavor to

[1] *Every Man out of His Humor*, Induction.
[2] Gifford, *Jonson*, iv, 189.
[3] *A Study of Ben Jonson*, 56.

reproduce the atmosphere of imperial Rome. This was *The Tragedy of Nero*, "newly written," as the title runs, and licensed for the press in 1624. The unknown author of this brilliant play, who was plainly no mean scholar, has followed his sources in Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dio Cassius with intelligent fidelity, and yet in so doing has contrived to represent to us the last four years of Nero's reign with a liveliness, with an instinct for dramatic effect, and with a clear discrimination of the famous historical figures — such as Piso, Lucan, Petronius, and Seneca — that crowd his canvas, that places his work beside the most consummate dramatic productions of his time. The figure of Nero, inordinately vain, suspicious, prone to flights of poetical imagination as to fits of uncontrollable passion or acts of satirical, vindictive malice, though simpler in conception, deserves a place beside Jonson's Tiberius and the Shakespearean Brutus and Cassius.

*Herod and Antipater*, 1622.

Vastly in contrast with this well-ordered tragedy is *Herod and Antipater*, printed in 1622, the work of Gervais Markham (author, with Lewis Machim, of *The Dumb Knight*) and William Sampson. Here in old-fashioned chronicle-wise is told how Antipater, base son of Herod, lived as his father's evil genius, compelling the murder of Mariam, Herod's sons, and many others, until he had gained, as he thought, his father's crown; how in the moment of his supposed triumph he is led to merited execution, and how his father's heart breaks as his son's head falls: a climax by no means ineffective. Of the same older type and similar in subject is *The Jews' Tragedy*, "their Fatal and Final overthrow by Vespasian and *Titus* his son, agreeable to the authentic and famous

Heming's *Jews' Tragedy*, c. 1638.

history of Josephus . . . by William Heming, Master of Arts of Oxon, 1662."[1] Heming was the son of Shakespeare's fellow-actor, John Heming, and his christian name may conjure pleasant images of the relations of the two elder men. William Heming was born in 1602, and we know little of him except that he proceeded to rid himself of the shares which he had inherited as a "housekeeper" in the Globe and Blackfriars theaters soon after he had proved his father's will in 1630.[2] Heming wrote another tragedy, *The Fatal Contract*, for the stage of his time.[3] He appears to have died before the closing of the theaters. *The Jews' Tragedy* is well written and full of variety. It concerns, in the main, the revolt of Judea in Nero's time and the doings of "the seditious captains," Eleazer, Jehoehanan, and Simeon, in defense of Jerusalem and against each other. The play is reminiscent throughout of the older drama, and not a few passages are imitative of the phrase and word of Shakespeare.[4] This Oxonian, unlike his fellows, was far from disdaining the furies, choruses, and dumb shows of the elder drama; and to cap his catholic art celebrates the final victory of Rome in a triumphal masque. A curious item might be added to the history of the stage could we but recover the circumstances of the acting of Heming's tragedies.

[1] The printing of *The Jews' Tragedy* in 1662 must have been posthumous. Heming wrote a comedy in 1633 called *The Coursing of the Hare or the Madcap*. It has perished.

[2] Fleay, *Stage*, 326; and i, pp. 182, 183.

[3] See above, i, pp. 426, 427.

[4] See, especially, the weak imitation of Hamlet's soliloquy, "To be or not to be," beginning with the very words, p. 29, of the quarto of 1662; the watch with its dim echo of Dogberry, pp. 32 and 40; and the Philaster-like mob, p. 35. Cf. *Philaster*, v, i.

From this point onward, barring occasional college dramas and the work of Thomas May and Nathaniel Richards, English tragedies on classical subjects cease to show that touch with the spirit of antiquity, even as understood and interpreted by Plutarch, Seneca, and other later writers, which had distinguished and differentiated most of the varieties of plays already examined in this chapter.[1] Nor is the reason far to seek. The facile romantic spirit of Fletcher, followed by the somewhat rhetorical eloquence of Massinger, now came to pervade the entire drama; and the Rome of Valentinianus or the Cæsarea of *The Virgin Martyr* become, as scenes for the drama, absolutely indistinguishable from the capital of *The Queen of Corinth*, the Iberia of *King and No King*, or the Sparta of Ford's *Broken Heart*. The changes which were made, as we have seen, to give to a plot of all but contemporary history — the story of the pretender Don Sebastian — a Roman atmosphere and setting, in *Believe as You List*, must have been comparatively trifling;[2] for to the true romanticist a flight to Carthage, Bithynia, or Callipolis was at least as easy as a flight to Arcadia, Utopia, or anywhere else.

Later romantic treatment of classical subjects.

The Fletcherian contribution to the drama founded on classical story — if by that adjective we may avoid the pitfalls of the mixed authorship of the Beaumont-Fletcher-Massinger group of plays — comprises some half dozen plays, ranging in revised form from the year 1612 or earlier to 1622; and some of them are of the very highest order of artistic merit.[3] To these

Fletcherian dramas in classic setting, 1612–30.

[1] As to May and Richards, see below, pp. 43, 45, 48, 49.

[2] See above, i, p. 430.

[3] Oliphant, *Englische Studien*, xvi, 198, believes *The Prophetess*

may be added Webster's *Appius and Virginia* of uncertain date, an adequate and stately play,[1] and four plays wholly by Massinger written between 1620 and 1630, completing a group of about a dozen dramas exhibiting a general carelessness as to source in historical material, a disregard of historic portraiture and a prevailingly romantic treatment of classical material.[2] Of the Fletcherian plays we may pass *The Faithful Friends*, a tragicomedy, the scene of which is laid in "Rome and the Country of the Sabines," a confused and ill-conceived production, variously assigned as to authorship.[3] The fine tragedy, *Bonduca*, is solely Fletcher's, but from its scene on British soil it has already received our attention among English chronicle histories.[4] The tragicomedy, *The Humorous Lieutenant*, is likewise Fletcher's unaided work, and appears to have been first acted after the death of Burbage in 1619. The major plot details the pure

*The Humorous Lieutenant*, after 1619.

a revision of an old play dating in the last decade of Elizabeth's reign, revised in 1622 by Fletcher and Massinger; places *The Faithful Friends* by Beaumont and Fletcher at 1604, its revision by Massinger and Field at 1613–14; *Bonduca* in early form, 1605, possibly Beaumont's, revised by Fletcher in 1612; *Valentinian*, 1612, and *The Humorous Lieutenant*, 1619, both wholly Fletcher's, and *The False One*, by Fletcher and Massinger, 1620. Fleay places *Bonduca* and *Valentinian* at 1616, ii, 203

[1] Above, i, p. 593.

[2] *The Virgin Martyr* was licensed in 1620, and as we have it is doubtless Massinger's revision of an earlier play of Dekker's, possibly *The Diocletian*, acted in 1594. *The Bondman* was first acted in 1623. *The Roman Actor* was registered in 1626; *The Emperor of the East*, licensed in 1631.

[3] Fleay suggests Daborne as the author of this play and places it at 1614. *Chronicle*, i, 200. Oliphant, xv, 331, considers this an old play of Beaumont and Fletcher of "say 1604," revised by Massinger and Field.

[4] Above, i, p. 302.

and devoted passion of Demetrius Poliorcetes for his fair captive Celia, her spirited repulse of the blandishments of the court, and the *dénouement* which unites her as the Princess Enanthe to her lover. All is told with the fluency and certainty of touch that is Fletcher's at his best; and is appropriately accompanied by the original and laughable "humors" of the lieutenant who gave to the play its name and its long and deserved popularity.[1] *The Humorous Lieutenant* is a romantic love tale referred gratuitously to the historical Demetrius. In Massinger's effective play, *The Bondman*, 1623, too, although it selects the time of Timoleon's deliverance of ancient Syracuse from Carthaginian invasion, the interest centers in Marullo, the leader of a revolt of slaves; nor is its historical quality or dramatic interest enhanced by the discovery, in the end, that the Bondman is a free-born gentleman of Thebes, thus disguised to further a revenge which love converts into a reconciliation. Once more, in *The Virgin Martyr*, which is Dekker's, revised by Massinger probably about 1620, not only is the material unhistorical, but a glamour of sentimental and supernatural interest is spread over the morally earnest theme which is altogether of the essence of romance. The greater part of this play narrates the story of Saint Dorothea, concluding with the conversion of Theophilus the persecutor and his

*The Bondman*, 1623.

*The Virgin Martyr*, 1620.

[1] This underplot Fletcher found in an anecdote of the soldier of Antigonus, related in Forde's *Theater of Wit*, 1660, and doubtless well known earlier. Koeppel, i, 83. A tragedy called *Demetrius and Marsina or the Imperial Impostor and the Unhappy Heroine* was among the manuscripts of Warburton, but not destroyed. What has become of it I do not know, nor whether it concerns any historical Demetrius. A play called *Greeks and Trojans* of the reign of Charles is mentioned by Collier, iii, 417, 425.

later martyrdom.[1] The angel, entertained unawares as her page by Dorothea, and the devil Harpax, as another of her servants, with their alternate promptings of good and evil, suggest the spirits attendant on Faustus. The story is set forth with much simplicity and directness, and is wanting neither in earnestness nor in pathos. But with all the poetry of Dekker, and Massinger's competent and serious rhetoric, it cannot be said that the best is made of a theme at once so happy and so ambitious. *The Prophetess*, attributed to Fletcher and Massinger, and licensed in 1622, more probably than *The Virgin Martyr*, is the *Diocletian* of Henslowe's mention of 1594;[2] though not impossibly that was an independent play. *The Prophetess* departs from history in attributing the rise of the Emperor Diocletian wholly to the spells and incantations of a sybil or witch named Delphia. The play seems hastily put together, the action is eked out by choruses and dumb shows, and the supernatural is inartificially handled. Altogether, *The Prophetess* is unworthy its alleged authors, and any faint flavor of antiquity derived from its source in Eusebius has evaporated once and for all.

*The Prophetess*, 1622.

There remain for consideration here, Fletcher's *Valentinian* and his *False One*, Massinger's *Roman Actor* and his *Emperor of the East;* and even in these quasi-historical dramas romantic passion or romantic crime has replaced all but wholly the representation of man as a belligerent and political animal to which we are apt commonly to limit our modern conceptions

*Valentinian*, 1617.

[1] Koeppel, ii, 82, finds all the elements of the story of Theophilus in the *Cologne Martyrology* of 1576. As to date and revival, see Oliphant, xvi, 191.

[2] Henslowe, 20.

of history. *Valentinian*, acted by the King's men in 1617, and perhaps originally staged as early as as 1611 or 1612,[1] is a typical example of the art with which Fletcher could expand the material of an obscure anecdote (here of Procopius) into a highly organized drama of abiding dramatic worth.[2] True, the Fletcherian types recur: Valentinian the lustful tyrant, Lucinia the steadfast wife, Aëcius the bluff, heroic soldier; but all is managed with that sureness of hand, that swiftness of action and natural unfolding of plot which we recognize as peculiarly Fletcher's, and the degeneracy of Maximus from a wronged husband to a conspirator against his sovereign, a usurper of his throne, and, to that end, the murderer of his noble friend and counselor, Aëcius, is a new theme and one thoroughly well handled. In *Valentinian* the admirable diction of Fletcher is at its best, ever adequate and graceful, rising to bursts of eloquence, and decked, but never overloaded, with the jewels of poetry. In *The False One*, 1620, wherein Massinger aided or revised Fletcher, we have a return to a more truly classical subject, the story of Cleopatra and Cæsar. But the conception of this play is wholly in the spirit of romance, although classical materials were evidently employed at first hand with a readiness that would have done credit to Jonson.[3] In this

*The False One*, registered 1620.

[1] Oliphant, xv, 358.

[2] Koeppel, i, 71, compares the plot to that of *The Faithful Friends*, which it somewhat resembles. He also suggests a comparison between the death scene of *Valentinian* and that of Shakespeare's *King John*. As a matter of fact, Fletcher follows Procopius, *De Bello Vandalico*, i, 4, very closely. See *Corpus Scriptorum Historiæ Byzantiæ*, "Procopius," 1833, p. 328.

[3] Koeppel adds nothing to Langbaine's suggestions of general sources in "Suetonius, Plutarch, Dion, Appian, Florus, Eutropius,

drama the authors seem scarcely to have met the demands of their subject. Neither the personality of Cæsar nor that of Cleopatra rises to convincing reality in their hands; and the intrigue seems unimportant and indistinguishable from any other.

Massinger's *Roman Actor*, 1626.

In complete contrast to this, it would be difficult to find a more favorable example of the easy mastery of the playwright's craft, the competent and informing eloquence and the moral earnestness that mark out Massinger from his fellows and predecessors, than is afforded by the finely conceived tragedy, *The Roman Actor*, registered 1626. Well may the author have declared that he "ever held it as the most perfect birth of his Minerva." It has been remarked by Ward that "there was a certain boldness in constituting an actor the hero of a tragedy, and in seeking to show in his person how true a dignity of mind is sometimes to be found where the world is least disposed to seek it." [1] For in the story of Paris, the Roman actor, who innocently incurs the jealousy of the Emperor Domitian because of the passion which his art has inspired in the Emperor's favorite mistress, Domitia, we have an appreciation of the dignity of the actor's art and a discrimination of the man beneath circumstances and mere avocation such as the literature of the age knew not elsewhere. Nothing could be finer than the mingled freedom and fidelity with which Massinger has used in his play the materials discoverable in Suetonius and Dio Cassius, and the ingenuity with which the playwright has contrived no less than three dra-

Orosius, etc." Langbaine, 209. Dyce states that several passages are imitated from Lucan's *Pharsalia*. Beaumont and Fletcher, American ed. 1854, ii, 39.

[1] Ward, iii, 25.

matic scenes of a play within his play, each introduced naturally, varying with the others, and yet contributing to the unfolding of the action. Far less praise can be bestowed on Massinger's later tragi-comedy, *The Emperor of the East*, licensed in 1631 and acted by the King's servants. This play deals with the history of Theodosius the Younger, and appears to be of very mixed derivation. As Koeppel justly remarks, "Massinger has turned the historical tragedy of the first four acts into a tasteless comedy in the last." [1]

*The Emperor of the East*, licensed 1630.

With *The Emperor of the East* we reach the last play of this kind, the work of a dramatist of the first rank. For despite Shirley's tactful use of classical story in such by-forms of the drama as *The Contention of Ajax and Ulysses*, and Ford's revision of Dekker's beautiful masque-like drama, *The Sun's Darling*, neither of them reverted in drama of stricter form to classical myth or story.[2] It is then to authors such as May, Nabbes, and Goffe that we must turn to trace the continuance of the drama based on classical theme. Thomas May is best remembered as the historian of the long Parliament and the translator of Lucan's *Pharsalia* and Vergil's *Georgics*. His memory has been contorted and embalmed by the caustic wit of Clarendon, though May was buried with honors in Westminster Abbey at the expense of the Council of State, in 1650.[3] May's dramas belong to his earlier manhood, his first comedy, *The Heir*, having been

Thomas May, 1595–1650; his classical dramas;

[1] Koeppel, ii, 126.

[2] The scene of *The Coronation*, licensed in 1635, as by Shirley and printed as Fletcher's in 1640, is laid in Epire. It contains "nothing historical beyond the sound of some of the names."

[3] *Life of Clarendon*, ed. 1827, i, 39.

acted as early as 1620. May's name attaches to four tragedies on classical subjects, of which two, *Cleopatra* and *Julia Agrippina*, appear to have been acted unsuccessfully in 1626 and 1628.[1] May's *Tragedy of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt*, is a stronger play than Daniel's *Cleopatra*, and freer from the trammels of classical example, both in conduct and in its fluent blank verse, though plainly written with the ideals of ancient tragedy in full view. The subject-matter presents a close parallel to Shakespeare's play save that the battle of Actium is related by a messenger and the ideal of the Queen is somewhat impaired by a momentary resolve on her part to try on Augustus those wiles and allurements which had temporarily captivated the great Cæsar and proved the undoing of Antony. Like Jonson in *Sejanus*, May names his classical sources in the margin, but is not overweighted by his authorities. *Agrippina* is an equally effective tragedy, swift, clear, and eloquent in parts. The subject enters to the full into the intrigue whereby that scheming princess raised her son, Nero, to the imperial throne, and details as well her fall and the rise of Poppæa.

his *Antigone*, 1631.

In 1631 May printed the *Tragedy of Antigone, the Theban Princess*, with a preface on tragedy and comedy containing nothing new or startling. May's *Antigone* is a strong play and far more than a translation. An example of inventiveness is the scene in which *Antigone* visits the field of slaughter to bury her brother, and meets with three hags prowling among the dead to rob them.[2] In the following scene these creatures are consulted as to the future by Creon, as Macbeth consulted the witches, and they cause a corpse

[1] None of the tragedies of May has been reprinted.

[2] III, iii.

to prophesy in a passage of gruesome horror. Another Shakespearean echo, perhaps, is the death of Antigone by "a gentle poison" in the moment of her rescue by her lover Æmon from the tomb in which she has been immured. May's *Antigone* is an interesting tragedy alike for such Shakespearean reminiscences and for the example which it offers of a mind classically trained and yet affected by the contemporary spirit of romance. This is especially illustrated in the unclassical prominence of the romantic attachment of Æmon and Antigone as in the novel employment of the supernatural already mentioned. A Latin *Julius Cæsar* by May of uncertain date remains in manuscript.[1]

Classical histories by Goffe, Henry Shirley, and Nabbes.

Thomas Goffe's contributions to the historical drama of the contemporary Ottoman Empire have already been mentioned.[2] His *Orestes*, acted by Christ Church students in 1623, is of like juvenile and melodramatic character. *The Martyred Soldier*, printed in 1638, by Henry Shirley, lays its scene in the time of Belisarius and Genseric, but tells a very unhistoric story of the christianizing and martyrdom of that famous general and the succession of an Emperor Hubert.[3] The one classical tragedy of Thomas Nabbes is the lengthy but by no means inadequate *Hannibal and Scipio*, acted in 1635, which narrates not only the story suggested in the title, but that of Sophonisba, and also much besides.[4] It is difficult to agree with Bullen that this play owes anything to

[1] *Biographia Dramatica*, ed. 1812, Part II, vol. i, 503.

[2] Above, i, p. 449.

[3] For other work of Henry Shirley, see above, i, p. 430.

[4] "Acted by the Queen's company at their private house in Drury Lane."

Marston.[1] It is an estimable work, even though contemporary stage fashion, in clash with classical ideals, did demand a representation of the victor of Lake Trasimenus as the victim of a sudden love passion for an unknown Roman captive at Cannæ. It is not impossible, from its rambling character, that this is the making over of an old play of the same title, by Rankins and Hathway, which held the stage of the Fortune as far back as 1601.[2]

William Cartwright, 1611–43; his tragicomedies, 1635–37.

Nothing could better illustrate with what completeness romantic ideals had taken possession even of those who, by training and association, might be expected to preserve a more scholarly attitude than the example of William Cartwright. Born in the year 1611, Cartwright was identified all his life with Oxford and noted for his scholarship. He was the friend and intimate companion of Ben Jonson, who commended his endeavors in drama with the words "my son Cartwright writes like a man." And yet Cartwright's three serious dramas, which fall between 1635 and a year or two later, albeit their scenes are Cyprus, ancient Persia, and historical Byzantium, are tragicomedies of the most approved contemporary romantic type. With the *Thesmophoriazusæ* of Aristophanes for his suggestion, Cartwright was capable, in his *Lady Errant*, of conceiving a women's conspiracy in ancient Cyprus which fails because the Lady Knight, Machessa, sends the conspirators' collected treasure to their enemy, the King, in fulfillment of a knightly vow of hers to succor mankind. *The Royal Slave* is a dramatizing of the Persian story of the Ephesian who was king for three days. It is

[1] Bullen, *Old Plays*, new series, *Nabbes*, i, xvi.

[2] Henslowe, 60, 125.

likewise conducted in the approved manner of late romance.[1] Lastly, *The Siege*, rewritten at the command of the king, and renamed in consequence of the appearance meanwhile of Davenant's *Siege*, *Love's Convert*, is a dramatic amplification of a story told of Pausanias, transferred to a siege of Byzantium.[2] Misander, besieging that city, demands that a virgin be sent him for his pleasure. Leucasia is thrust into his tent in the night with the command of her father that she kill the tyrant. Upsetting and extinguishing a lamp in her tremor, she is stabbed in the breast by Misander, who takes her for an assassin. Moved by her sad plight and her beauty, Misander becomes "love's convert" and makes her his queen. *Love's Convert* is a creditable production and well written, though of none of Cartwright's tragicomedies can it be said that they possess dramatic sinews. Their contemporary success, which was great, seems to have been based on extraneous circumstances. *The Lady Errant* was performed, to judge by its prologue and epilogue, before royal personages, if not at court, and with the female characters taken by women, outside of the masque an extraordinary innovation in the year 1635. *The Royal Slave* was presented by students of Christ Church before the king and queen, on the occasion of their visit to Oxford in August of the next year, and revived at royal request a few months later by professional actors at Hampton Court, where the royal verdict was rendered that the students acted best.[3] Another novelty connected with

[1] For the circumstances of the performance of this play, see below, p. 90.

[2] Plutarch, *Cymon*, cap. 6, also Boccaccio, ix, 1.

[3] Collier, ii, 76–78.

the performance of *The Royal Slave* was the change of scene eight times.[1]

Gough's *Strange Discovery*, 1640; Richards' *Messalina*, pr. 1640.

*The Strange Discovery*, in which John Gough told in dramatic form the story of *Theagenes and Chariclea* of Heliodorus, and Nathaniel Richards' *Tragedy of Messalina, the Roman Empress*, both printed in 1640, complete this tale of the later tragedies and histories modeled on ancient story, though many titles suggest that this enumeration might be much extended. Of Gough practically nothing is known. His play is rambling, full of event, and not skillfully plotted.[2] Richards was a Devon man, born about 1612 and educated at Caius College, Cambridge. He retired to his native place, Kenvistown, in 1654, where he succeeded to his father's ministry. Richards' one drama, *Messalina*, deserves more than a mere mention, and may well have "passed" upon the stage, as the preface informs us, "the general applause as well of honorable personages as others." This play belongs to the type of *Sejanus* and the tragedies of May, and its classical authorities are as carefully noted. Messalina is a monster of lust, coveting every handsome man she meets; while, on the other hand, Sylana, the constant wife of Silius, is an admirable foil, and, in her purity and heroic devotion,

[1] Cf. the marginal stage directions of the quarto of 1639.

[2] It seems likely that Gough used Underdown's translation of *Heliodorus*, 1569. The subject had been employed before by Gosson in his *Theagenes and Chariclea*, 1572, and perhaps in a play called *The Queen of Ethiopia*, acted at Bristol in 1578 by Lord Howard's men. A late tragedy, *Andromana*, 1640, also draws upon Heliodorus, but with the intervention of Sidney's *Arcadia*. On this topic, see "Heliodor und seine Bedeutung für die Litteratur," by M. Oeftering, *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, xviii, 149–155.

measurably above the unconvincing chastity of the prudishly pure women of Fletcher. Richards is especially happy in depicting the disarming infirmity of purpose that comes to the wickedly great in crucial moments demanding moral courage. Though his Empress-paramour command it, and his heroic victim offer her breast to his stroke, Silius dare not kill his wife; and Messalina's own trivial wounding of herself on the scaffold is a mixture of heroic impulse and Sybaritic shrinking from pain which is as true to life as dramatically effective. With little imagery and next to no poetry, *Messalina* is none the less an able and interesting play.

Summary.

In this chapter we found the Elizabethan dramas which sought their material either directly or mediately in ancient story beginning in imitations of Seneca, under masters holding Italian and French ferules, and reaching, in the graceful court dramas of Daniel and in the politico-philosophical tragedies of Greville, a development beyond which the drama thus restricted could not be expected to pass. Popular Seneca had long since passed through Kyd and Marlowe into the tragedy of revenge, and left forever behind it not only classical subjects, but classical rules. Thus, when Heywood popularized classical mythology for the audiences of Newington Butts or the Rose, he was trammeled by no precedents and treated his material precisely as he chose. Shakespeare, too, was untrammeled; but the artist sufficed in him to give to the world in *Julius Cæsar* a form of greater freedom than that which had hampered the imitators of Seneca, and yet to crystallize into artistic beauty such material as had remained amorphous in the hands of Heywood. Jonson then arose with all his

scholarship in him to protest in *Sejanus* against the amateurishness of these unlearned men. But in his protest Jonson declared his pedantry; and Marston, ever ready with the dagger of insinuation, virtuously disclaimed, on his own part at least, any attempt "to translate Latin prose orations." It was then that Shakespeare triumphantly confuted all cavil as to the success of classical history and myth freely treated in the fine succession of his plays on ancient theme which cluster about the year 1607; and it was immediately thereafter that Jonson returned to the contest in *Catiline*, and proved that there was something to be said even yet on the side of the classicists. *Catiline* was really the last word, for despite such followers as the unknown author of the *Nero* of 1624, Thomas May, and Nathaniel Richards, thereafter dramas of this class, as of nearly all others, came under the powerful romantic sway of Fletcher.

# XIV

## THE COLLEGE DRAMA

TWO lines of development in the drama of the Elizabethan age have already been suggested and defined. Upon these lines were evolved two kinds of drama. One was vernacular, vulgar, bustling, and realistic, but vitalized with the breath of the people; temporary as to those outward qualities that spring from momentary taste or passing fashion; immortal at times by reason of the preservative power of its artistry and enduring poetry, and because of the breadth of its appeal to the universal elements of human nature. The other was the academic drama, the creation of the school, the court, and the universities. Its foundations were learning and precedent, its superstructure culture and good form. It delighted in nicety of expression and in polish of detail. Although it never rose to the conception of art as its own end and fulfillment, but kept its nine muses ever in the antechamber of royalty, the waiting-ladies of fashion, it had yet its ideals or at least its theories. Nor was the college drama without its successes, of which more anon. Yet before we proceed to the well-defined group before us, let the reader be once more advised of the purely provisional nature of all classifications; and let him remember, as to the distinction just drawn, that not only were popular plays of the London stage again and again performed at court and at the universities, but that

Academic *versus* popular drama.

the reflex influence of the court drama and the masque — even of the narrowly academic plays of Oxford and Cambridge — upon the popular stage, while less easily traceable in concrete example, cannot but have been appreciably strong. In a word, it was the incessant interpenetration of these two classes of plays that made the Elizabethan drama much of what it was.

Popular plays at the universities.

Of the earlier drama of school and court enough has been written. We have found this species of play, too, continued in the works of Daniel and his kind, and we shall discuss the by-form known as the masque in a later chapter.[1] If mere performance at Oxford or Cambridge were our sole criterion in this place, our classification might be as complex as that of the drama at large. *Hamlet* was acted at both universities; and other plays of Shakespeare must have been acted at Oxford on the visits of his company to the seat of the university during the early years of the reign of King James.[2] *Volpone* was reproduced at both universities before its printing in 1607, and with such success that it called forth an enthusiastic dedication to the "two most noble and most equal sisters" from the delighted author. As Jonson's play could not have been written more than a year earlier, this may be taken as an example of the avidity with which an academic audience often welcomed a success of the London boards. Nor would the mere character of the play be at all times a sufficient guide to its academic nature; for although the universities practiced and held to certain types of drama

[1] See chapters ii and iii, and below, chapter xv.

[2] Lee, *Shakespeare*, 224; Halliwell-Phillips, *Visits of Shakespeare's Company to Provincial Towns*, 1887, under Oxford.

in the main, their variety was considerable and their wanderings into the domain of popular comedy not infrequent. In the preceding pages no attempt has been made to separate the academic drama from that which flourished at court or among the people. But nowhere else has it seemed possible to treat distinctively the many plays which reflected specifically the atmosphere of Elizabethan university life, and which followed the theory of precedent and scholarship rather than those rules of thumb which were discovered to be practiced or denied by the popular playwrights in their very making. An endeavor will be made in this chapter to consider the university play both as to its history and as to the peculiar species of drama which it came in time to evolve.

Early theatrical performances at Oxford and Cambridge.

Theatrical performances in the halls and refectories of the universities date from early times. For Oxford, the records begin in 1486 with a performance at Magdalen College and continue with various references to miracles, interludes, and plays (*ludi*) down to the period of the regular drama.[1] In 1512 at Oxford one Edward Watson was granted a degree on the condition that he write a Latin comedy; in 1546 at Cambridge students were fined for not taking their parts.[2] A nameless play was acted at Cardinal College in 1530;[3] one Thomas Artour wrote *Mundus Plumbeus* and *Microcosmus* at Cambridge between 1520 and 1532;[4] and Anthony a Wood records a Latin comedy, *Piscator or the Fisher*

[1] See Chambers, ii, 194, and his Appendix E, *ibid.* 248.

[2] Boase, *Register of Oxford*, quoted by the same, 194; Mullinger, *History of Cambridge*, ii, 73.

[3] *Calendar of State Papers*, iv, 6788.

[4] Wallace, *The Birthe of Hercules*, 39.

*Caught*, by John Hoker, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, as acted therein in 1535.[1] Grimald's *Christus Redivivus* was presented at Brasenose about 1542, his *Archipropheta* at Christ Church in 1547.[2] And these apparently complete the tale of Oxford plays prior to the accession of Elizabeth. At Cambridge, save for the mention of the gift of half a mark by one William de Leune and his wife to be expended in a play called *Ludus Filiorum Israelis* upon their admission to the guild of Corpus Christi in 1350;[3] and the enumeration of "a pall, six masks and beards for the comedy," in the accounts of the College of Michael-House in 1386, the list of university performances begins with the *Plutus* of Aristophanes, given in Greek at St. John's College in 1536.[4] In 1545 great offense was offered to Bishop Gardiner by the public performance at Christ's College of the antipapal *Pammachius*. Receiving an equivocal answer to his first letter of complaint and inquiry, Gardiner pressed an investigation, but appears to have gained little satisfaction from the stubborn but far from candid defense of Vice-Chancellor Parker and the other university authorities.[5] That no serious interference with the drama at Cambridge ensued is shown by the performance, in the next year, of the *Pax* of Aristophanes and of a tragedy of *Jephthes* by John Christopherson, both at Trinity College.[6]

[1] *Athenæ Oxonienses*, i, 138.

[2] *Register of Oxford*, i, 298; and *Narcissus*, ed. M. L. Lee, 1893, p. xiii.

[3] Master's *History of Corpus Christi College*, p. 5.

[4] *Retrospective Review*, xii, 7; Mullinger, ii, 73.

[5] Herford, 129–132; see above, i, 39.

[6] John Dee, *Compendious Rehearsal*, Appendix to Hearn, *Joan-*

Roger Ascham, tutor to the daughters of Henry VIII and to Lady Jane Grey, has left behind him in his *Scholemaster* some pleasant chat as to the practice of the Latin drama at Cambridge in his youth. In the following passage we may see at once the models, the ambition, and the pedantry of the time: "Whan M. Watson in S. Johns College at Cambrige wrote his excellent *Tragedie of Absolon*, M. Cheke, he and I, for that part of trew imitation, had many pleasant talkes togither, in comparing the preceptes of Aristotle and Horace *de Arte Poetica*, with the examples of Euripides, Sophocles, and Seneca. Few men, in writyng of tragedies in our dayes, haue shot at this marke. Some in England, moe in France, Germanie, and Italie, also haue written tragedies in our tyme: of the which, not one I am sure is able to abyde the trew touch of Aristotles preceptes and Euripides examples, saue onely two, that ever I saw, M. Watsons *Absalon*, and Georgius Buckananus *Jephthe*. One man in Cambrige, well liked by many, but best liked of him selfe, was many tymes bold and busie, to bryng matters upon stages which he called tragedies. In one, whereby he looked to wynne his spurres, and whereat many ignorant felowes fast clapped their handes, he began the *protasis* with *trochoeiis octonariis:* which kinde of verse, as it is but seldome and rare in tragedies, so is it never used, save onelie in *epitasi:* whan the tragedie is hiest and hotest and full of greatest troubles. I remember ful well what M. Watson merelie sayd unto me of his blindnesse and

Ascham and the drama at Cambridge.

*nis Glastoniensis Chronica*, 501; and Warton, iii, 303. Chalmers, ii, 195, finds no trace of the former play, the chief interest of which was the contrivance for the flight of a mechanical scarabæus across the stage.

boldnes in that behalfe, athough otherwise there passed much frendship betwene them. M. Watson had another maner care of perfection, with a feare and reverence of the judgement of the best learned: Who to this day would neuer suffer yet his *Absalon* to go abroad, and that onelie, bicause, in *locis paribus*, *anapestus* is twise or thrise used in stede of *iambus*."[1] Ascham, in his *Epistles*, states that he had himself translated the *Philoctetes* into Latin.[2] It has unhappily perished with the learned author's treatise on cock-fighting. A comedy entitled *Strylius*, by Nicholas Robinson, later Bishop of Bangor, was acted at Queen's College, Cambridge, in 1553.

Dramatic entertainment of the queen at Cambridge, 1564.

The history of Elizabethan drama at the sister universities begins with the year of Shakespeare's birth. In that year, 1564, Elizabeth visited Cambridge, and "the days of her abode were passed in scholasticall exercises in philosophie, physic and divinity; the nights in comedies and tragedies, set forth partly by the whole university and partly by the students of King's College."[3] It is of interest to know that of the plays projected for performance, one was the *Aulularia* of Plautus, a second a translation into Latin of the *Ajax* of Sophocles, a third, an original Latin play by Edward Halliwell on the familiar subject, *Dido;* and the fourth, "*Ezechias* in English." This last was a play of Nicholas Udall's; and as Udall died in that year, it has been happily suggested that the play was staged by former students of his at Eton.[4] *Ajax Flagellifer* was not acted; whether the queen was weary

[1] *The Scholemaster*, ed. Arber, 139.
[2] Hazlitt, *Manual*, 179.
[3] Nichols, *Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, ed. 1823, i, 150.
[4] Fleay, ii, 265.

with "ryding in the forenoone and disputations after dinner; or whether anie private occasion letted the doinge thereof, was not commonly knowen," says one of our contemporary informants.[1] Towards all of the other plays Elizabeth was exceedingly gracious, and as to *Dido* it is related that Thomas Preston, later the author of *Cambises*, "acted so well . . . and did so genteelly and gracefully dispute before," that the Queen gave him twenty pounds per annum for so doing.[2]

Plays before the queen at Oxford, 1566.

At Oxford Edmund Campion heads the list of Latin dramatists of the reign. Campion later became a famous Jesuit emissary and suffered martyrdom in 1581 for his zeal and opinion. His tragedy, called *Nectar et Ambrosia*, was acted in 1564, probably at St. John's College, at which he was, at that time, a scholar.[3] Campion bore a distinguished part in the disputations before the queen on the occasion of her visit to Oxford two years later. On this occasion, as at Cambridge, her majesty was regaled with addresses in Latin, Greek, and English, with sermons, disputations, and plays. Three of these last are recorded, the anonymous *Marcus Geminus*, *Progne*, a tragedy by James Calfhill, and *Palæmon and Arcyte* by Richard Edwards of her majesty's chapel; the last in English, performed on two consecutive evenings, and a very great success. A feature of this performance was "the acting of a cry of hounds in the

*Palæmon and Arcyte.*

[1] Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 179. See Mullinger, ii, 190 n., for a denial of the Spanish story that a play ridiculing the rites of the Roman Church was acted on this royal visit.

[2] *Ibid.* 245.

[3] This play was revived at Oxford in the year of Campion's death; one would fain know the circumstances.

quadrant upon the train of a fox in the hunting of Theseus."[1] Elizabeth gave the author "great thanks for his pains;" and, delighted with the young actor who took the part of Amelia, sent him eight angels "for gathering her flowers prettily in a garden there represented and singing sweetly."[2] Edwards was in a sense the queen's dramatist, a man of maturity, and much admired for his *Damon and Pythias*, the success of Christmas, 1563, at court. It is not remarkable to hear, then, that *Progne* "did not take half so well" as "the much admired *Palæmon*,"[3] or that it was debated among the auditors, if this latter play was not even better than *Damon and Pythias*. The same year witnessed other performances at Oxford: *Ariosto*, probably one with the *Supposes* of Gascoigne, another popular success at court, acted at Trinity, an English comedy, and the *Eunuchus* of Terence at Merton, and perhaps a revival of *Gammer Gurton* at Christ's.

Popularity of the drama at the universities.

With the royal sanction and approval thus given in her visits, it is not to be wondered that the drama continued to flourish at both universities; and that scarcely a winter passed without performances, far more of them (it may be surmised from the many manuscripts yet extant) than have been handed down in the records. Thus the two universities divide almost equally some sixty plays, extant and recorded, between the year 1564 and the close of the queen's

[1] Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 210, 212; and Plummer, *Elizabethan Oxford*, 124, 128, and 138; and see W. Y. Durand, "Notes on Edwardes," *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iv, 35, in which the fuller Latin account of Bereblock is given in translation. The original appears in *Elizabethan Oxford*, iii.

[2] Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 212.

[3] *Ibid.* 215.

reign, thirteen being in English, of which six are still extant. While some of the college plays conform to classical methods and ideals, they exhibit a considerable range and variety in subject and source, as will be further set forth below. Passing *Byrsa Basilica* by John Rickets, 1570, and Legge's *Richardus Tertius*, nine years later, which are peculiar for their English subjects, and both of which have been treated above,[1] we find William Gager prominent during the eighties in the writing and staging of Latin plays at Christ Church College, Cambridge. Gager's tragedy, *Meleager*, was acted before the Earl of Leicester, Sir Philip Sidney, and other persons of distinction in 1581;[2] his *Dido*, wherein the setting was "all strange, marvelous, and abundant," together with "a pleasant comedie intituled *Rivales*," before the Prince Palatine of Poland, in 1583. *Ulysses Redux*, which with *Meleager* was printed, and an *Œdipus*, complete the tale of Gager's work.[3] A fragment of the last in manuscript discloses a near acquaintance with the *Phœnissæ* of Seneca; and indeed all of these tragedies are cast in the stricter mould of Roman example. On the other hand, Meres rates "Dr. Gager of Oxford" among the best poets of comedy.[4] It is of interest to record that George Peele was among the younger men who helped in the preparation of *Dido;* and that under Gager's influence he translated one of the *Iphigenias* of Euripides, but whether into Latin

William Gager;

[1] See i, pp. 255, 285.

[2] *Athenæ Oxonienses*, i, 88.

[3] For the content of these plays, see *ibid.* 87, 88. *Meleager* was printed in 1592; *Ulysses* in the same year. Another *Meleager*, apparently in English, is described in the *Athenæum*, September 14, 1901.

[4] *Palladis Tamia*, Haslewood, ii, 154.

his controversy with Rainolds.

or English does not appear.[1] On the publication of *Meleager*, Gager sent a copy with a letter defending college plays to Dr. John Rainolds, afterwards President of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. Rainolds answered by an attack upon the practice of college plays, using Gager's own *Rivales* by way of example, and arraigning "with especial vigor the appearance on the stage of youths in women's cloths;" and the contest continued in replication and rejoinder until the publication by Rainolds, in 1599, of a pamphlet entitled *The Overthrow of Stage Playes* . . . "wherein all the reasons that can be made for them are notably refuted."[2]

Satirical nature of some academic plays; Nash at Cambridge.

Turning to Cambridge, it was in 1582 that Thomas Nash matriculated at St. John's, remaining "seven year together, lacking a quarter," having taken his B. A. in 1585–86. According to Harvey, his malignant enemy, Nash, narrowly escaped expulsion for his "hand in a show called *Terminus et non terminus*, the precise nature of which we do not know."[3] It was quite in the character of Nash to have left the university for his caustic and ungoverned wit; and, with due allowance for satirical exaggeration, it seems certain that his quarrel with Harvey extended to the representation of that pragmatical doctor, albeit he was

[1] See above, i, p. 134.

[2] Sidney Lee in *Dic. Nat. Biog.* xx, 358; and see Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*, 95–101, for this academic continuance of an old popular controversy. See, also, above, i, pp. 147–151.

[3] *Trimming of Thomas Nash*, Grosart, *Harvey*, iii, 67. Fleay, ii, 124, on Harvey's words, "this foresaid Nash played in it (as I suppose) the varlet of clubs," conjectures this one with *The Play of Cards* mentioned in Harington's *Apology for Poetry*, Haslewood, ii, 135.

Spenser's Hobbinol, on the academic stage. Nash challenges Harvey to deny that he was represented with his two brothers in a "show made at Clare-hall" called *Tarrarantantara turba tumultuosa Trigonum Tri-Harveyorum, Tri-harmonia;* or that "the little minnow, his brother, Dodrans Dick," was not staged at Peterhouse under the sobriquet *Duns Furens.*[1] Later on Nash breaks forth: "What will you give me when I bring him uppon the stage in one of the principallest colledges in Cambridge? Lay anie wager with me, and I will; or if you lay no wager at all, Ile fetch him aloft in *Pedantius*, that exquisite comedie in Trinitie Colledge; where under the chiefe part, from which it tooke his name, as namely the concise and firking finicaldo fine school-master, hee was full drawen and delineated from the soale of the foote to the crowne of his head."[2] This passage has been thought rather to refer to *Pedantius* as representing in beau-ideal the very Harvey himself, than to imply that this witty and satirical play was written in actual ridicule of Nash's foe.[3] Be this as it may, enough has been said to indicate the extent to which even personal satire entered into these university plays. This was to continue a striking characteristic of academic comedy to the end; and, indeed, this is the one quality which, from its temporary nature, is least capable of carriage across the centuries into a time which knows not the personalities, the trivialities, and the allusions to pass-

[1] *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, Grosart, *Nash*, iii, 118.

[2] *Ibid.* 117.

[3] The latest editor of *Pedantius*, Professor G. C. Moore Smith, regards the character as a certain portrait of Harvey, and he certainly makes out a strong case. See his excellent edition in *Materialien zur Kunde*, 1905, viii, pp. xxxii–l.

ing events on which personal satire must ever be more or less founded.

Latin college plays: *Pedantius*, 1581.

*Pedantius* is the work of Anthony Wingfield or of Edward Forsett; perhaps of both.[1] It was first acted in the Hall of Trinity College in February, 1581, and has been thought to be the continuation of an earlier perished comedy in which some of the personages — notably the pedant — had already been represented.[2] This witty and satirical production may be taken as a typical academic comedy of its day. In it Crobulus, freedman of Charondas, is the favored suitor of Lydia, who still remains Charondas' slave. Pedantius also loves Lydia; but as her master refuses to manumit her without the payment of thirty pounds, and Crobulus has nothing, he hoaxes Pedantius into paying the money while he obtains the girl. The scene and characters suggest Plautus; but the point of the piece is in the title rôle, Pedantius, the absurd Ciceronian, and in the foil of Pedantius, Dromodotus, a foolish humanist philosopher, in whose combined absurdities are ridiculed the foibles and affectations of the learned.[3] The characters are by no means ill drawn, and Lydia "is as pretty, and as pert, and as willing to be married as any chambermaid" of modern farce. Many Latin plays followed *Pedantius* at both universities in the last decade of the century. A minor one at Cambridge is *Victoria* by Abraham Fraunce, the writer of hexameters, a comedy intricate in its

[1] *Ibid.* pp. xi–xx, where it is shown that both these persons fulfill the conditions of authorship, and the claims of Dr. Thomas Beard and of Walter Hawkesworth are disposed of.

[2] See the reasons assigned for this opinion, *ibid.* pp. xxvi, xxvii.

[3] Cf. *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 277, where some suggested "influences" may also be found, and mention of other dramatic pedants of the time, not omitting Holophernes.

intrigue and unoriginal in its borrowings of phrase and repetition of stock figures.[1] The most notable, perhaps, was the *Bellum Grammaticale*, acted, possibly, not long after at Christ Church, Oxford, before the queen, though "meanly given," we are informed.[2] In this curious production an allegorical war between the forces of *Poeta*, *Rex Nominum*, and *Amo*, *Rex Verborum* is conceived, in which the combatants (among them *Ego* with the pronouns as marines, and *Cis* with an Amazonian host of prepositions) are ranged against each other in long-winded contention. But despite the gloating joy of *Solicismus*, *Cacotomus*, and other *grammaticae pestes*, the kingdom of grammar is at length set in order by Priscian, Lilius, and other *grammaticae Judices*, and such punishments as the cutting off of the passive voice of *doleo* and *volo* forever and the loss of all cases by *fas* and *nefas*, are among the terrible penalties inflicted. We are not surprised to find that this curious play was not an invention of the year 1581, but dates back to 1512, and to the ingenious authorship of Andrea Guarna of Salerno; and further, that Bale, in his list of the plays of Radclif, in 1538, mentions a *Nominis ac Verbi Pugna*, doubtless the original of this Oxford play.[3] *Bellum Grammaticale* is a favorable example of the persistence of the methods of medieval drama in late

*Bellum Grammaticale*, c. 1581.

[1] See the recent edition of this comedy by G. C. Moore Smith, *Materialien zur Kunde*, xiv (1906), pp. ix and xiv. This play dates before 1583. Fraunce had been notable for his acting at Shrewsbury School and later took a part in Dr. Legge's *Richardus Tertius*. He was a protégé of Sir Philip Sidney, to whom *Victoria* is dedicated.

[2] Halliwell, *Dictionary*, 31.

[3] Bale, *Index*, 333. The notion of Bond, *Lyly*, i, 380, that his author was in any way concerned in *Bellum Grammaticale* or Gager's *Rivales* must be pronounced wholly fanciful.

times, further exemplified in such a production as *Lingua*, and even in Ben Jonson's reversion to morality types in his latest comedies.

College plays in English: *Club Law*, 1597.

From these Latin plays of the reign of Elizabeth let us now turn to performances in English, which, though few in point of number, are, some of them, very striking. An example of the license of some of these plays is contained in the comedy *Club Law*, acted, like the plays to which Nash alluded, at Clare Hall, in 1597, and the work of George Ruggle, a notable Latin dramatic satirist of the time. On the performance of this "merry but abusive comedy," as Fuller called it, "the mayor, with his brethren, and their wives were invited" to attend, and the townsfolk, "riveted in with scholars on all sides," were compelled to hear out a piece in which, to use Fuller's words, "they did behold themselves in their own best clothes (which the scholars had borrowed), so lively personated their habits, gestures, language, liegerjests, and expressions, that it was hard to decide which was the true townsman, whether he that sat by, or he who acted on the stage." [1] A complaint to the lords of the privy council brought a civil reply to the effect that some of their number would presently journey to Cambridge and have the play again performed, this time before them, that they might judge of its libelous character and mete out suitable punishment, if need be. But the townsmen gladly dropped the matter rather than suffer public lampooning a second time.

At Christmas, 1598, was acted at St. John's the first of an interesting trilogy of academic plays entitled *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus* and *The Return* thence

[1] Fuller, *History of Cambridge*, ed. 1840, p. 218.

in two parts. The last of these alone saw print; the others were only discovered in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, some twenty years since.[1] *The Pilgrimage* details the career of two youths, Philomusus and Studioso, who journey, by way of the well-known *trivium*, through the island of "Logique," described as " muche like Wales, full of craggie mountaines and thornie vallies," through the pleasant groves of "Rhetorique," where "Tullie's nightingale" sweetly sings, and into the harsher climate of Philosophie, until they reach "the laurell shadie grove" upon Parnassus' top. Nor are they without temptation by the way, from Madido, the taverner, who would drink anything rather than "that pudled water of Helicon in the companie of leane Lenten shadowes," to the Puritan Stupido, who esteems " Mr. Martin [Marprelate] above all authors and hates all rimers for their "diabolical ruffs and wicked great-breeches full of sin." [2] *The Pilgrimage* is little more than an interlude; but its simplicity of plan and the universality of its types, from Consiliodorus, the admonitory father, and his talkative servant, to Ingenioso, the disenchanted sojourner in Parnassus, who has burned his books, "splitted his pen," and declared "Apollo a banckroute," were sure to take the fancy of the academic audience before which it was acted.

The trilogy of Parnassus plays: *The Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, 1598.

In the first part of *The Return from Parnassus*, emboldened by his success, the author sets forth, in more elaborate mould, "the progress (or rather retrogression) of learning towards a settlement in life." Philomusus and Studioso leave the university to seek pre-

1 *Return from Parnassus*, acted 1601-02.

[1] By W. D. Macray, who published all three parts in 1886. The *Second Part of The Return from Parnassus* was first printed in 1606.

[2] Macray, 7, 12, 20.

ferment, and, rebuffed on every hand, find place, the one as a sexton in a village church, the other as tutor to a low-born dolt, on terms little better than menial. But the indignities of their service become intolerable; they break away, and on their further journey towards London fall in with some of their university friends, whose efforts to secure patronage and preferment help to swell the scene and prove, in the end, as abortive as their own. A new and capital figure of this *Part* is Gullio, "fool of fashion and patron of poetry," who quotes whole passages of Shakespeare as his own, and complimented on his "reading in the English poets," replies: "I vouchsafe to take some of their wordes, and applie them to mine owne matters by scholasticall invention." [1] The play ends with a determination on the part of Philomusus and his friends to hie "to Rome or Rhe[i]ms" to end or mend their state, as did many an English poor scholar of the day, in the bosom of the enemies of England.

2 *Return from Parnassus*, 1602.

The *Second Part of The Return from Parnassus*, acted in the next year, continues the theme of the first with the greater confidence and elaboration born of success. It digresses somewhat to justify its sub-title, *The Scourge of Simony*, in several scenes of excellent comedy disclosing how Immerito, who had never seen a university, carries off a living from Academico, "a scurvy mere Cambridge scholar," by bribing Amoretto, the feather-brained son of Sir Frederick, the patron. It is this part of the play, too, that contains the personal satire on Francis Brackyn, deputy recorder of Cambridge, who had opened himself to academic attack by the unpopular part which he had taken in a recent controversy as to precedence between

[1] *Ibid.* p. 57.

the mayor of Cambridge and the vice-chancellor of the university. As to the main plot, Ingenioso becomes a satirical pamphleteer, and with his friend, Furor Poeticus, ends in the Isle of Dogs. Philomusus practices for a time as a French doctor; at last with Studioso he determines to go on the boards of the common stage, and Burbage and Kemp are introduced in their own persons testing the abilities of the would-be actors.[1] But even this last shift proves futile, and the play ends with the resolution of the two unhappy scholars to end their days as shepherds on the Kentish Downs.

Authorship and interpretation of the Parnassus plays.

The authorship of these three interesting comedies remains unknown; for ingenious as is the superstructure erected by Gollancz upon the bare surmise that John Day might have been the author of these plays, neither external nor internal evidence, sufficient to carry conviction, has as yet been forthcoming.[2] Nor can the conservative scholar feel more content with the attempts of Fleay and Sarrazin to interpret the typical personages of the Parnassus plays into a more or less complete allegory of "the ill-fortunes of the university poets."[3] Ingenioso in the last play is Nash; the term, "young Juvenal," his experiences as a pamphleteer, his *Isle of Dogs*, make the identification unmistakable. Nor need we deny the probability of the identification of Furor Poeticus with Marston, nor that of Philomusus, the French doctor, with Lodge, whose degree in medicine was of

[1] Macray, 138.

[2] Day's authorship was first broached in *Notes and Queries*, Third Series, ix, 387. The whole subject is fully discussed by Ward in a long note, ii, 640; and by O. Smeaton in his ed. of the play, 1905.

[3] Fleay, ii, 347–355; Sarrazin, *Kyd und sein Kreis*, 78–93.

Avignon. Beyond this all is doubt after the manner of allegory; and least of all can we follow Sarrazin's notion that Studioso is the poet of the original *Hamlet*.[1] It seems likely that the author began diffidently with a wholly impersonal play, *The Pilgrimage*, a production which, save for its little piece of farce, a clown lugged in with a halter because "a play cannot be without a clowne," contains no allusion to things personal or contemporary.[2] Succeeding beyond his hope, the author turned his eye to the popular stage. Jonson's *Every Man in His Humor*, *Every Man out of His Humor*, and *Cynthia's Revels* were performed between the *Pilgrimage* and the first *Return*, and while the melancholy tone of discontent and repining that underlies the Parnassus plays with all their wit is far from the bitter and authoritative censorship of Jonson, it cannot be denied that the great satirist's influence is potent in them. Gullio is thoroughly Jonsonian; and so is the whole underplot of Simony in the third play. Herein the author speaks with the abandon that success had brought him, and not only satirizes in allegory, but brings real personages, Burbage, Kemp, and the printer Danter, on the stage and in their own names.

Allusions to contemporary poets in the Parnassus plays.

There remains one other topic of interest arising out of the Parnassus plays. They contain several passages in outspoken criticism of poets and dramatists of the day, thus affording us an excellent example of the academic attitude towards the new popular literature that luxuriated beyond the college walls. Spenser is "a sweeter swan than ever song in Poe;" Daniel "doth wage warre with the proudest big Italian that melts his heart in sugared sonneting." Drayton's

[1] *Ibid.* 88. [2] Macray, 22.

"Muse is like a sanguine dye, able to ravish the rash gazer's eye;" and Marlowe, "happy in his buskined Muse, alas unhappy in his life and end." [1] These were all college-bred men, and, save for Daniel, who is elsewhere charged with plagiarism, Cantabrians. Jonson, on the other hand, "is the wittiest fellow of a bricklayer in England;" [2] and Shakespeare's name elicits: —

The academic estimate of Shakespeare.

> "Who loves not Adon's love, and Lucrece' rape?
> His sweeter verse contains heart throbbing life,
> Could but a graver subject him content
> Without love's foolish lazy languishment." [3]

This in the year of the acting of *Hamlet*, and after the completion of the splendid series of Shakespearean historical plays, save *Henry VIII*. The Parnassus plays attest the popularity of Shakespeare, whose repute had penetrated even "Granta's cloistered halls;" but it is Gullio, the foolish would-be poet, who quotes him galore, and will have "his picture in my study at the courte;" [4] and Kemp, the morris dancer and clown on the common stage, who gives him his highest praise in the often-quoted and certainly satirical deliverance: "Few of the university pen plaies well, they smell too much of that writer

[1] *Ibid.* 84, 85, 86.

[2] *Ibid.* 87. The second husband of Jonson's mother appears to have pursued that trade; Jonson was taunted with having been apprentice to it.

[3] *Ibid.* 87.

[4] *Ibid.* 58. I cannot agree with Arber (ed. *Return from Parnassus*, 1879, p. xiii), who takes this passage as proof of Shakespeare's "confessed supremacy at that date, not only over all university dramatists, but also over all the London professional playwrights." Mullinger gives the true interpretation, *History of Cambridge*, ii, 524 n.

Ovid, and that writer Metamorphosis, and talke too much of Proserpina and Juppiter. Why here's our fellow Shakespeare puts them all downe, aye, and Ben Jonson, too." [1]

*Narcissus*, 1602.

There remain two college plays in English which fall in point of performance, perhaps problematically, within the reign of the queen. One is the slight but clever little anonymous burlesque, *Narcissus*, acted at St. John's College, Oxford, Christmas, 1602; the other the lengthy and elaborate allegory *Lingua*, now considered the work of John Tomkins of Trinity College, Cambridge, and later the author of *Albumazar*.[2] *Narcissus* is as frank a parody as "the tedious brief scene of young Pyramis and his love Thisbe" in the hands of Bottom and his mechanicals, and depends for its fun on the jingle and absurdity of its rimes, on its distortion of epithet, and its mock heroics. A hunting song in which the refrain imitates a cry of hounds suggests the success of the same device in *Palæmon and Arcyte* years before; [3] and the setting of the scene for the suicide of the hero by the strewing of grass and boughs, to indicate the depths of the woods, and a bucket in the midst for the fatal spring, is completely in the spirit of the Shakespearean Wall and Moonshine.[4]

*Lingua*, before 1607.

*Lingua* is an academic allegory of surprising elaboration and completeness. It is fluently and well written, and was printed again and again, first in 1607. Its minute directions as to costume show that it must

[1] *Ibid.* 138.

[2] Fleay, ii, 260. P. A. Daniel first suggested this ascription of authorship. See Fleay and Furnivall, in *Shakespeariana*, March, 1885, and April, 1890.

[3] *Narcissus*, ed. Lee, 1893, p. 17, and cf. above, pp. 57, 58.

[4] *Ibid.* 18, and *Midsummer Night's Dream*, v, i.

have been handsomely staged; but where and when remain in question, as neither Fleay's doubt that a plot so deprecatory to woman could have been acted in Elizabeth's reign, nor Ward's interpretation of the allusions to "our gracious sovereign Psyche" as references to Elizabeth seem sufficient to decide.[1] *Lingua* tells of the plot of the tongue — which is appropriately feminine — to receive recognition as one of the senses, of the dissension which she sows among the five senses to that end, and of her final discomfiture and the allowance of her claims only so far as womankind are concerned. In an astonishing number of scenes and among a throng of abstractions, extending from Memoria, "the oldest living inhabitant," who forgets his spectacles in the three hundred and forty-ninth leaf of Holinshed's *Chronicles*, to Tobacco, who talks West Indian gibberish, the author holds his even way, always equal to his theme, often clever, sometimes witty. An absurd myth of later Cavalier making has attached itself to this play to the effect that "the late usurper Cromwell (when a young man) had therein the part of Tactus; and this mock ambition for the crown is said to have swollen his ambition so high, that afterward he contended for it in earnest." [2] The circumstance that Cromwell was at most eight years of age at the time of the first publication of *Lingua*, to say nothing of the probable first acting of the play some years earlier, would daunt any one but Fleay, who recognizes in *Lingua* the play acted at Hinchinbrook in Cromwell's uncle's house before King James on royal progress to London in

Oliver Cromwell's alleged rôle in *Lingua*.

[1] Fleay, ii, 261; Ward, iii, 174.

[2] Winstanley, quoted in Dodsley, ix, 334. The story has been traced to S. Miller, who published an edition of the play in 1657.

1603, and the part which the destined Protector then took (being three years of age) as not that of Tactus, but that of Small Beer![1]

Employment of shifting scenery at Oxford, 1605.

The magnificence of the costumes of *Lingua* has just been mentioned, and in an early chapter of this book will be found a passage giving a contemporary description of the manner in which the Common Hall of Christ Church, Oxford, was transformed into "the grandeur of an old Roman palace" and furnished with stage, cushioned seats, and myriads of candles fittingly to receive her majesty, Queen Elizabeth.[2] Early in the reign of James a new feature was added to the performance of university plays, whence it must soon have spread, to a greater or less degree, to the popular stage. This was variation of scene, the earliest step from the rudeness of the simultaneous scenery of the old London playhouse to modern pictorial setting.[3] It was during the visit of King James to Oxford in 1605 that Inigo Jones successfully solved this interesting problem in stage carpentry. "The stage," we are informed, "was built close to the upper end of the hall, as it seemed at first sight: but indeed it was but a false wall, fair painted and adorned with stately pillars, which pillars would turn about; by reason whereof with the help of other painted cloths, their stage did vary three times in the acting of one tragedy."[4] The play was a Latin one, *Ajax Flagellifer*, which with *Alba* and Gwinne's

[1] Fleay, ii, 262.

[2] Above, i, p. 108, where the passage from Bereblock's account of the queen's visit in 1566 is quoted.

[3] For a discussion of the settings of the London theaters, see above, i, pp. 171–179.

[4] Quoted by Malone, *Variorum Shakespeare*, iii, 81, from Leland's *Collections*, ed. 1770, ii, 631, 646.

*Vertumnus* served this auspicious occasion. It is of interest to know, too, that Jones received fifty pounds for his novel designs, despite the untoward circumstance that "the king was very weary before he came thither," and "much more wearied" by the tragedy, of which it is regretfully reported that "he spoke many words of dislike." [1]

Theatromania at Oxford in 1607.

But the royal presence was not imperative to theatrical undertakings at Oxford. Only two years after this visit of King James, Oxford went for the nonce theatrical mad, and happily for our information we have the naïve narrative of one Griffin Higges, an undergraduate in 1607, who was evidently in the midst of it all.[2] Owing to some reminiscence of the days of the boy bishop or the example which the students of the inns of court were setting in their Christmas festivities, some of the "poulderings," or second year's men, of St. John's determined upon the election of a Christmas Prince and the device of fitting entertainments for his welcome and honor.[3] Their plans met with such success that a sort of theatrical contagion spread from gownsmen to townsmen, and from the Freshmen, who had a capital farce of their own in English, to the Dons who gravely enacted matter tragical in the learned tongue. Beginning with the Prince's instalment in a device called *Ara Fortunæ*, the celebration

[1] *Ibid.* 639; also quoted by Malone, *ibid.* 82 note.

[2] Printed from the original MS. in *Miscellanea Antiqua Anglicana*, 1816, vol. i.

[3] On the Lord of Misrule at the universities and a fuller account of this particular occasion than there is space for here, see Chambers, i, 407–413; and also, as to the latter, the present author's *Thalia in Oxford, The Queen's Progress*, 201. See *Gesta Grayorum* for an account of the Christmas Prince of Gray's Inn in 1594, printed in 1688, and reprinted in Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 262–352.

continued with the performance of Latin tragedies (*Philomela* and *Philomanthes*), masques and morrises, allegories, and morals (*Somnium Fundatoris* and *Time's Complaint*), and comedies Latin and English to the number of some score of performances given and projected, ending close to Lent with the masque of the Prince's resignation, *Ira seu Tumulus Fortunæ*. Some of the plays were private; most were public, and acted in the college halls on tables set together for a stage. The press of the audience, even on the stage, was such at one performance, at least, that it was once thought that the play "could not be performed that night for want of room." [1] On the giving of a later play, some unruly spirits raised what Higges called "a tumult without the windows," whereupon "the whifflers made a raid upon them with their swords and drove the crowd out of the precincts, imprisoning some until after the play was over." [2] There were accidents. The Prince, who was to play Tereus, "had got such an exceeding cold that it was impossible for him to speak, or speaking to be heard." [3] The Prologue of *Time's Complaint* forgot his lines, and "Goodwife Spiggott, coming forth before her time, was most miserably at a nonplus and made others so also, whilst herself stalked in the midst like a great Harry-like lion (as the audience pleased to term it) either saying nothing at all or nothing to the purpose." [4] But there were successes as well. *Philomanthes* elicited from the delighted audience cries of "*Abunde satisfactum est!*" [5] Detraction, placed in the audience, played his part so well "that he was like to have been beaten for his sauciness;" [6] and "Itys was much wondered at for

Trials and triumphs of an amateur performance.

[1] *Miscellanea*, as above, 69. [2] *Ibid.* 73. [3] *Ibid.* 26.
[4] *Ibid.* 33. [5] *Ibid.* 57. [6] *Ibid.* 74.

speaking Latin because he was so little in his long coat that he was taken to be but a child of seven or eight years old." [1] It is significant that, notwithstanding that "the style" was seriously argued against the performance of one play, "for that it was English, a language unfit for the university," the greatest success of the entire festivity was a mock play, called *The Seven Days of the Week*,[2] in the despised vernacular, written for the younger boys who could not do "serious things." [3]

Late Elizabethan academic tragedies.

Let us return to the Latin academic drama which continued with unabated zeal in composition and performance at Cambridge, if not equally at Oxford, throughout the reign of King James and far into that of his son.[4] Religious subjects were now of the forgotten past, and so, for the most part, were tragedies founded on classical myth.[5] The comparatively small number of Latin plays which chose subjects from Roman history are more scattering, and range from

[1] *Ibid.* 29.

[2] *Ibid.* 70; this trifle is printed, *ibid.* 39–55.

[3] Latin college plays of the reign of James, not already mentioned in the text, are: (1) at Oxford *Alba*, with Gwinne's *Vertumnus*, staged by Inigo Jones, *Atalanta* by Philip Parsons, *Spurius* and *Theomachia* by Peter Heylin, and *Philosophaster* by Robert Burton, the famous author of *The Anatomy of Melancholy;* (2) at Cambridge, *Euribates* by Aquila Cruso; *Homo* by Thomas Atkinson, *Adelphe*, which "lasted six hours and the court slept," *Æmelia* by one Cecil, and *Pseudomagia* by William Mewe; (3) of uncertain college are *Fraus Pia*, a comedy, scene London, *Romeus et Julietta*, *Adrasta* by Peter Mease, *Sophomorus*, *Loiola* by John Hacket, and *Clitophon* by William Ainsworth.

[4] There are twenty or more plays acted at Cambridge, extant or recorded between 1605 and 1640; Oxford shows two thirds as many.

[5] A *Sapientia Salomonis*, possibly a translation, was acted in 1566 (*Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 224); William Goldingham's *Herodes* belongs a little later (*ibid.* p. 242); and see above, pp. 53–60.

*Marcus Geminus* of the queen's early visit to Oxford to Thomas May's *Antigone* of 1631. The typical play of this group is Dr. Gwinne's *Nero*, already described.[1] Apparently no definite relation, chronological or other, can be established between the academic tragedies dealing with Roman history and the French Seneca of Daniel and Alexander, much as these affected such themes. The same aloofness cannot be affirmed of the two Senecan tragedies, *Solymannidæ* and *Roxana;* for the first may not impossibly have suggested to Greville, as already noted, the subject of his *Mustapha*. *Roxana* was acted at Cambridge before 1592, and is the work of William Alabaster, praised by Spenser in his *Colin Clout*, and recently restored to an honorable place among the devotional sonneteers of the reign.[2] The story of *Roxana* is one of palace intrigue, laid in as imaginary a Bactria as Greville's "ancient kingdom of Ormus," but this strange place of scene is, after all, only a device of Alabaster's to conceal the source of his play, *La Dalida* of Luigi Groto, wherein Alabaster's King Oromasdes bears the name of Gyges' victim, Candaule, and his Atossa, the more generic Berenice.[3] Although perhaps somewhat improved in brevity and condensation, and displaying, we may well believe, an unimpeachable Latinity, it may be doubted if *Roxana* deserves the praise of Dr. Johnson, who, in one of his oracular moods, declared of Latin poetry in England: "If we produced anything worthy of notice before the *Elegies* of Milton, it was perhaps Alabaster's *Roxana*." [4]

Gwinne's *Nero*, pr. 1603.

*Roxana*, 1592.

[1] See above, pp. 34, 35.

[2] Grosart's *Spenser*, iv, 49; *Athenæum*, December 26, 1903.

[3] Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, ed. 1854, iii, 54.

[4] *Life of Milton*, Tauchnitz ed. i, 57.

Italian sources for English academic comedies.

The derivation of this tragedy of Alabaster was no unusual one among English academic writers of the day, who studied the drama of Italy no less assiduously than did the popular playwrights. But the influence of Italian models was strongest in comedy. No less than a score of Latin plays remain to attest the popularity at the universities of the comedy of ingenious intrigue; and a few of them certainly vie with the earlier works of Chapman and Jonson in this kind, which it is interesting to observe are ultimately referable to much the same models. Among the few Latin comedies which have been referred to their sources, the anonymous *Hymenæus*, 1580, draws on the *Decameron;* and *Lælia*, 1590, is a translation of *Gl' Ingannati* and the undoubted immediate source of Shakespeare's *Twelfth Night.*[1] Giovanni Battista della Porta, a contemporary Neapolitan physician, and dramatist, seems to have enjoyed among the collegians an exceptionable vogue as a quarry for the material of academic plays. This was doubtless due to the success with which this Italian drew upon Terentian and Plautine characters and situations, and complicated the latter in ingenious and novel plots. Walter Hawkesworth translated Porta's *La Fantesca* and *La Cintia* into plays entitled *Leander* and *Labyrinthus*, acted at Cambridge in 1598 and 1599. The latter is described as "occasionally so decidedly *contra bonos mores*," that, to use the words of the excellent old critic, "we may almost wish it was more so." [2] Far more important than either of these plays was the famous *Ignoramus*, the plot of which is taken from Porta's *Trappolaria*, and the well-written and divert-

[1] *Variorum Twelfth Night*, 1901, p. xxi.

[2] *Retrospective Review*, xii, 35.

*Albumazar*, 1615.

ing English comedy of John Tomkins entitled *Albumazar*, 1615, which owes much to the same Italian author's *L'Astrologo*.[1] These comedies commonly unite with intrigue and disguise the element of satire, which often so overlays the original plot as to give to the result a quality wholly new.

*Ignoramus*, 1615.

Doubtless no better illustration of this union could be found than in *Ignoramus*, first acted at St. John's College, Cambridge, before King James in March, 1615, and often repeated and printed.[2] George Ruggle, its author, was a successful tutor at Clare Hall and a scholar almost equally well acquainted with classical and Italian literature, hence his recourse to *La Trappolaria*, which in itself owed much to the *Pseudolus* of Plautus. But Ruggle's play is far from wanting originality either in character or event. For its chief personage, the satirical figure of Ignoramus, the pettifogging lawyer, with his villainous jargon of dog Latin, bad English, and law French, the "living example of barbarous Philistinism," as Ward well calls him, is the English author's own. *Ignoramus* was staged with careful attention not only to the histrionic abilities of the actors in it, but to the social standing and influence of those immediately concerned. In consequence the comedy was a great success. So delighted was the learned king with its wit, telling satire, and (we may well believe) with its

[1] This is the comedy which Dryden referred to in a prologue, on the occasion of its revival in 1668, as affording Jonson the suggestion for his *Alchemist*. Scott-Saintsbury, *Dryden*, x, 417. It was first acted at Trinity College, Cambridge, before King James, in March, 1615.

[2] Translated into English by Robert Coddington and printed in 1662. Cf. also, the dissertation of J. L. Van Gundy, Jena, 1905.

broad obscenities ("over which its Latin dress flung, in those days, a very imperfect veil"), that, not succeeding in inducing the performers to repeat the play in London, he journeyed to Cambridge two months later to see it acted again.[1] James ever after preferred Cambridge to Oxford; but the Oxford wits, with as much justice as malice, observed that *Ignoramus* was staged with "a perfect diocese upon the stage;" [2] and it was this play, more than any other, that heightened the Puritan aversion to such performances and drew from Milton the scathing passage of the *Apology for Smectymnuus* wherein he describes "young divines, and those in next aptitude to divinity," as he had seen them "upon the stage, writhing and unboning their clergy limbs to all the antic and dishonest gestures of Trinculoes, buffoons, and bawds, prostituting the shame of that ministry which either they had, or were nigh having, to the eyes of courtiers and court ladies, with their grooms and mademoiselles." [3]

Milton's strictures on the performance of this play.

But it must not be supposed that the college drama was given wholly over to the Plautine comedy of intrigue seasoned with the gross and telling satire of contemporary allusion. Popular influences were at work in the universities as in the drama elsewhere; although, as might be expected, it was the drama of the court that most immediately affected the academic plays. Among such influences we must count the pastoral, which came into the drama, as we shall

Pastoral influence on academic plays.

[1] On the performance of *Ignoramus*, see Mullinger, ii, 528, 548.

[2] Corbet, *Poems*, ed. Gilchrist, p. 13.

[3] *Prose Works of Milton*, ed. 1851, iii, 267. Objection had been made ten years earlier to the performance of a play entitled *Alba* at Christ Church because men who acted in it had appeared on the stage almost naked. Hazlitt, *Manual*, 5.

see, after its vogue in fiction and lyrical poetry. For although this influence is suggested in *Silvanus*, a Latin comedy by Rollinson acted at Cambridge as early as 1596, and although, early in the reign of James, both Guarini's *Pastor Fido* and Groto's *Pentimento Amoroso* were translated into Latin, the latter under the title *Parthenia*, at the same university, it was the well-known court poet, Samuel Daniel, who took the pastoral to Oxford.[1] It was there, in 1605, that his *Queen's Arcadia* was performed in English, before Queen Anne and the ladies of her court. And save for *Scyros* and *Melanthe*, Latin pastorals, both by Dr. Samuel Brooke, acted at Cambridge in 1612 and 1615, and a *Silvia* of uncertain date, English seems to have remained the favorite language of this form of drama even at the universities thereafter.[2] Besides *The Queen's Arcadia*, pastorals in English at the universities include the interesting "piscatory" of Phineas Fletcher entitled *Sicelides*, projected for performance at Cambridge on the king's visit in March, 1615, and a lost *Stonehenge* of John Speed of uncertain date. The pastoral drama in England will claim our later attention, for it differed little at court, at the universities, and on the boards of the London stage.[3]

Other extraneous influences.

Other and later indications of extraneous influences on the academic drama are to be found in Dr. Jasper Fisher's *Fuimus Troes*, "a story of Britaines valour at the Romanes first invasion," a rhetorical and undramatic attempt at Oxford to revive the chronicle play a generation after its hey-day; [4] and in Thomas

[1] *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 294, 318–322. [2] Fleay, i, 42; ii, 35.

[3] See below, chapter xvi.

[4] An earlier play of similar subject-matter is *Fatum Vortigerni*, *c.* 1600. See above, i, p. 306.

Goffe's belated *Courageous* and *Raging Turk* acted at the same university and of much the same date.[1] These three plays are in English. But even the Latin plays show this reversion at times to earlier popular subjects and models, for, aside from May's oftenmentioned *Cæsar*, we have at the end of our period *Thibaldus sive Vindictæ Ingenium Tragœdia*, the work of Thomas Snelling, in which the familiar theme of the revenge of a son for a father is carried out by the equally familiar method of a masque.[2]

Satire and allegory the chief elements in academic comedy.

When all has been said, it was satire and allegory which continued most to animate the drama of the colleges. On the visit of James to Cambridge in 1615 and on the night preceding the performance of *Ignoramus*, *Æmilia* by Cecil was acted, ridiculing a foolish tutor of physic. *Loiola*, 1622, by John Hacket, ridiculed the Jesuits in "coarse and commonplace vein;" while the Puritan formed the stock figure for satirical attack from the *Re Vera* of Ruggle in 1598 to Reynolds' plays in the early thirties and Strode's *Floating Island* on the verge of the civil war. As to allegory in the academic drama, it remained persistent to the end. There was Heyelin's *Theomachia*, acted at Magdalen, and Holiday's *Technogamia* or *Marriage of the Arts*, both in 1618. The last, which was in English, James is reported three years later to have made three sundry attempts to escape.[3] There was *Stoicus Vapulans*, an allegory of the passions, in 1627,

[1] See above, i, p. 449.

[2] This play is doubtfully identified by Margaret L. Lee, *Narcissus*, 1893, p. xv, with the same author's *Pharamus sive Libido Vindex*, 1640. See J. Bolte's "Note on Thibaldus," *Jahrbuch* xxvii, 228.

[3] Nichols, *James*, iv, 715.

in which Appetitus, Irascibilis, "Voluptas, and others of the same family successively are introduced whipping and scourging the Stoic in every variation of circumstance and meter."[1] To omit other later examples, *Fallacy or the Troubles of the Great Hermenia* by R. Zouche of New College, Oxford, 1631, remains in English manuscript in the British Museum as the tedious *Floating Island*, 1636, remains in cold print to attest how hard was allegory to kill in the shelter of the cloister, even after the glories of Shakespeare had shone full on the English world for a generation.[2]

*Apollo Shroving*, 1626.

Before pursuing our enumeration of the plays acted at the universities, it may be well to note that the grammar schools (in which, as we have seen, the modern drama practically began) still continued to emulate the histrionic activity of their elders at Oxford and Cambridge. Although for the most part but little remains save an occasional mention to show that the ancient custom of acting plays in such schools was common in the time of King James and in that of his successor, as it had been before, one comedy at least deserves mention for its curiosity as well as for its representative character as a production of the type.[3]

[1] *Retrospective Review*, xii, 35.

[2] For this play of Strode's, see below, p. 89. Richard Zouche, born in 1590, was notable for his academic activities and his legal attainments. At one time Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford, he died in 1661, a judge of the Admiralty.

[3] An interesting glimpse into the earlier practice of plays at Shrewsbury School is offered by Professor G. G. Moore Smith in his edition of Fraunce's *Victoria, Materialien zur Kunde*, xiv, p. xvi. An ordinance of the Bailiffs, 1577–78, provided that "everie thursdaie the Schollers of the first forme . . . shall for exercise declame and plaie one acte of a comedie." Among the plays acted on occasions was *The Passion of Christ*, 1561 and 1568, and *Julian the Apostate* in 1566, besides many others not described by name.

*Apollo Shroving* was composed for the scholars of the Free School of Hadleigh in Suffolk, and acted there by them on Shrove Tuesday, 1626. While the old morality spirit is preserved in the main theme, a contest between Learning and Queen Hedone, the whole is conducted by means of sprightly dialogue and pointed allusion which must have proved highly acceptable to a scholarly audience. In the prologue Dame Lala from the audience raises objection to Latin, and to learned allusions, and pertinently asking "why should not women act men as well as men and boys act women," strides up to the "tiring house" to "scamble and wrangle for a man's part." Not without point, too, is the notion of Dame Indulgence, riding up the steeps of Parnassus in her coach and four, her son and darling, John Gingle, and his puppy, Thisbie, sitting in her lap, while she condescendingly waves her fan at the "common people" that pass. *Apollo Shroving* has been assigned to the authorship of William Hawkins. It is of interest to know that the chief actor in it was Joseph Beaumont, later to take his place among the minor poets with his *Psyche*, and ten years of age when he took a chief part in his school's play.

Academic plays in the reign of Charles.

To return, this tale of academic plays in the reign of King Charles might be easily augmented by reference to the plays of Wilde, Meade, Neale, and Zouche, at Oxford, and Vincent, Hausted, and Pestell, at Cambridge.[1] Nor would a complete census neglect the

Thomas Ashton, the headmaster was prime mover in these performances, which were given in a huge amphitheater, enthusiastically praised by Thomas Churchyard in his *Worthies of Wales*, 1587, Spenser Society's ed. p. 85.

[1] George Wilde wrote *Hermophus* and *Euphormus*, besides two

literary activity of Englishmen such as William Drury and Joseph Simeon or Simons, in the English Jesuit College at Douay.[1] Besides, many manuscripts of college plays remain unidentified as to author, date, or place of performance, though it is doubtful if the resurrection of these jetsams of time would add much to our knowledge of the age. It is, then, to the later college plays in English that we turn in conclusion; for although they reflected more fully than their predecessors prevailing popular influences, they retain — some of them at least — much of the academic flavor. We may pass with mention two anonymous satirical dialogues, acted at Cambridge in the reign of James, the first entitled *Exchange Ware at Second Hand, viz., Band, Ruffe, and Cuffe* (a second edition in 1615), the other, *Work for Cutlers or a Merry Dialogue between Sword, Rapier, and Dagger*, printed in the same year.[2] The latter is but a slight affair, and interesting chiefly as showing, with many other productions of its type,

English plays, *Love's Hospital* and *The Converted Robber*, between 1634 and 1638; Robert Meade wrote *The Combat of Love and Friendship*, 1636; Thomas Neale, *The Ward*, in the next year; and Zouche, his *Sophister*, in 1638. At Cambridge, Thomas Vincent's *Paria* was acted in 1627; Peter Hausted's *Senile Odium*, after 1630; Thomas Pestell wrote *Versipellis*, a comedy of uncertain date. Other Cambridge Latin plays after 1625 were *Senilis Amor*, and *Valentudinarium* by William Johnson. See, also, the important plays named in the text.

[1] Drury, who was Professor of Rhetoric at Douay, wrote *Alfredus*, *Mors*, and *Reparatus*, all probably acted in the refectory of the English College and printed between 1620 and 1628. Simeon's *Zeno* was acted at Cambridge in 1631, and published at Rome; another tragedy of his, *Leo Armenus*, was printed in 1657 and 1680. Both are "*tendenz*" dramas.

[2] A copy of *Exchange Ware* was recently sold among the Lefferts books in New York. *Work for Cutlers* is reprinted in *Harleian Miscellany*, x, 200.

the persistence of the *débat* or dialogue of controversy at the universities as elsewhere. It was some dozen years later that the same university produced the most notable of the strictly academic dramatists, Thomas Randolph, although his work, taking it all in all, is little more than an extension and glorification of the *estrife* or *débat*.

Thomas Randolph, 1605–35.

Thomas Randolph was a Westminster boy, and through the usual promotions, fellow and M. A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, and *ad eundem* of Oxford as well. He has been enthusiastically described as "one of those bright spirits, which burn too fast, cast a vivid flash over their time, and then suddenly expire; . . . one so supplied with vigor, both mental and corporeal, as to have started, pursued, and ended his race by the time that the phlegmatic genius of other men is just ready for the race." [1] Certain it is that after a brilliant studentship and striking success before royalty at Cambridge and in London as a playwright, Randolph died at the early age of twenty-nine.

His dramatic work:

His dramatic work falls between 1629 and 1633, and includes, besides a Latin play, *Cornelianum Dolium*, somewhat doubtfully his, *Amyntas*, a pastoral of distinction, a comedy, *The Jealous Lovers*, *The Muses' Looking Glass*, two dramatic *jeux d'esprit*, and a translation, ungovernably free — rather a complete readaptation — of the *Plutus* of Aristophanes.[2] The earliest of these was probably *Aristippus*, an amusing and farcical dialogue in which the famous old philosopher of the title rôle dialectically maintains the honor of sack against its rival, ale, to the final conviction

[1] *Retrospective Review*, vi, 61.

[2] See Fleay, ii, 168. *Cornelianum Dolium* is ascribed to T. Riley in *European Magazine*, xxxvii, 344.

and conversion of a "malt-heretic." Published with *Aristippus*, in 1630, is *The Conceited Pedlar*, a brief but witty monologue in which that personage exhibits his wares with satirical comment. But Randolph was soon to attempt less trivial matters. For performance before the king, on the royal visit to Cambridge in 1632, Randolph wrote *The Jealous Lovers*, an ambitious comedy in the favorite Plautine academic manner, and achieved a marked success, notwithstanding that the critical reader of to-day discovers in this brilliantly written play an artificiality of plot and a violence in the *dénouement* that robs the production of any claim to serious consideration as a product of dramatic art. In *The Muses' Looking Glass* Randolph conceived not only an original theme, but one in which fully to display the talents which were his. The scene is a playhouse (from the date, probably Salisbury Court) whither two Puritans, Bird, a feather-man, and Mistress Flowerdew, a pin-woman, — delightful caricatures, — are come to vend their wares to the players.[1] Roscius, the actor, detains them to witness a series of scenes in which are humorously represented the figures of human vices or humors in pairs, each the extreme of the other, according to the Aristotelian theory, while in the end all concludes with the glorification of "golden Mediocrity, the mother of virtues." Randolph's purpose, as Ward well explains it, was the vindication of the moral power of comedy in the form of dramatic satire;[2] and while the influence of Jonson was upon him — especially the influence of Jonson's later revulsion to the methods and ideals of the old moralities — nothing can detract from the wit, the

*The Jealous Lovers*, 1632.

*The Muses' Looking Glass*, 1634.

[1] Fleay, ii, 166.

[2] Ward, iii, 135.

originality, and clever characterization within the limits of abstractions which mark the personages of this interesting production. Lastly, there is the Aristophanic *Plutophthalmia Plutogamia*, englished *Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery*, which has been somewhat dubiously attributed to Randolph, but which, whether his originally or not, has certainly been interpolated with passages full of allusion to events which occurred after Randolph's death. Read with Randolph's undoubted work, it seems, in its broad humor, satirical fun, as in its powerlessness to substitute character for abstraction, almost certainly Randolph's.[1]

*Hey for Honesty*, 1635.

Contemporary with the college plays of Randolph, and owing its small worth to his example, is Peter Hausted's *The Rival Friends*, which contains in its composite make-up a comedy of intrigue, elements of the pastoral, the heroic disinterestedness of pseudo-romance, and a satire on the Puritans and on the un-Puritan practice of simony.[2] Hausted's play was acted before King Charles in 1631, and was so ill received that when after some difficulty it appeared in print, it was with the taunt: "Cried down by boys, faction, envy, and confident ignorance; approved by the judicious and exposed to public censure by the author." Cambridge contributes but one other name to the history of the drama, that of the amiable man and genuine poet, Abraham Cowley. Cowley is the stock example of poetical precocity, having appeared in a published volume of verse, *Poetical Blossoms*, in 1633,

Hausted's *Rival Friends*, 1631.

[1] See note preceding this play in *Works of Randolph*, 1875, ii, 2. For *Amyntas*, after all Randolph's best play, see below, pp. 174, 175.

[2] Note, especially, the violence of the *dénouement*, which resembles that of *The Jealous Lovers*.

Cowley's *Naufragium Joculare*, 1638.

at the early age of fifteen years. His amusing *Naufragium Joculare* was acted at Trinity in 1638, and enjoyed a great success from the boisterous vivacity of a scene — albeit borrowed from the *Captivi* and paralleled in Heywood's *English Traveller*—in which a bevy of drunken revelers delude themselves into the notion that they are at sea, though housed on land, and carry out many farcical capers in making good their delusion. Cowley's satirical comedy in English, *The Cutter of Coleman Street*, was first acted at Cambridge in the year 1641 under its earlier title, *The Guardian*. How the impartiality of the royalist poet's satire, which reached the unworthy Cavalier as well as the hypocritical Puritan, later brought down criticism upon him is matter beyond the limits of our theme.[1]

Plays at Oxford on the royal visit of 1636.

The last important group of college plays was that which greeted King Charles on his visit to Oxford in 1636. Charles had now ruled for seven years without a Parliament, and Strafford—his impeachment and desertion by his master yet to come — had carried his policy of "thorough" over to unhappy Ireland. Laud was pressing heavily upon men whose opinions conformed not with his own, and in our little world of the drama William Prynne had written his dull, fanatical, and bulky attack on the stage entitled *Histriomastix; The Player's Scourge*. It was his malignant unorthodoxy and the implication of libel against the queen and her ladies that brought Prynne to trial, not his attack upon the theater. Stripped of its pedantry, violence, and exaggeration, there was undeniable truth in Prynne's allegations, though novelty there was none; and the outrageous penalty which was in-

William Prynne and his *Histriomastix*, 1632.

[1] For Cowley's pastoral, *Love's Riddle*, see below, p. 176.

flicted upon the hapless author marked more the temper of the time than the magnitude of his offense.[1] This is not the place in which to discuss the effect of Prynne's book and trial on the drama. Prynne had been punished for the first time in 1634, and he was to stand once more in the pillory in 1637, so that the performance of plays at Oxford in 1636 before royalty may be taken as one of the several protests against the approval of Prynne's book. Be all this as it may, Charles and Laud were entertained at Oxford in August with several plays, among them *The Floating Island* by William Strode, and *The Royal Slave* by William Cartwright. In the preface of the former, the author, who was orator of the university and later canon of Christ Church, informs us that he wrote "at the instance of those who might command him; else he had scarce condescended to a play, his serious thoughts being filled with notions of deeper consideration." With such admonition as this we plunge into a weighty allegory of the passions. These, under guidance of certain malcontents, among them Malevole, who by a dozen allusions is certainly Prynne, rebel against their sovereign, Prudentius, and choose Dame Fancy for queen. She proves so inconstant that she cannot even determine whether to accept a coronet, "a Turkish turbant," a "Persian cydaris" or a circlet of bright-colored feathers for her crown; and in the end each passion having refused the crown, all

*The Floating Island*, 1636.

[1] Prynne "was sentenced in the Star Chamber to lose both his ears in the pillory, to be branded on the cheeks 'S. L.,' Seditious Libeller, to suffer a fine of five thousand pounds, and finally to be expelled from Lincoln's Inn, deprived of his degrees, and sentenced to life imprisonment." For a good account of Prynne and his book, see E. N. S. Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*, 1903, pp. 159–178.

are reconciled, and Prudentius resumes his burden.[1] Only the contemporary significance of this production could have rendered its portentous gravity and persistent mediocrity endurable. In it is mirrored the satisfied complacency of the Cavalier and his contempt for the "malignant," as he called him, whose right even to be heard he denied and whose steadfast courage in arms he had not yet tested. *The Royal Slave*, greatly in contrast to this amateurish production, was the work of a writer already tried in two plays before royalty. Cartwright's tragicomedy is stilted, heroic, well-written, and full of high and unnatural sentiment; it is in no respect, save the accident of performance, an academic play; and is memorable perhaps chiefly as one of the earliest plays to denote changes of scene in print. The scene was "varied" no less than seven times in *The Royal Slave*, and five different settings called "appearances" are specified.[2] For these novelties and its handsome costuming Cartwright's play was a great success.

Cartwright's *Royal Slave*, 1636.

Out of this cursory survey of the academic drama of our period several facts and generalizations arise. First, the large number of these plays and the large proportion of that number still extant, together with their variety within certain well-defined limits cannot but surprise the casual reader. In Elizabeth's own time the strictly academic plays were almost entirely written in Latin; but English gained more and more in the reigns of her successors until, late in the time of Charles, more English plays were acted at Oxford in

Amateurish character of university plays.

[1] *The Floating Island*, 1655, II, iv; v, viii and ix.

[2] These scenes included the Temple of the Sun, a stately palace, a wood, a castle, and a city with a prison "on the side." See quarto of 1639; and cf. above, i, p. 449.

three years than are recorded for the whole of Queen Elizabeth's reign. Again, the pervasiveness of the influence of Plautus, filtered through Italian imitations in comedy, is as notable in these plays as is the persistence of satire, the method of allegory, and the absence in them of anything like "growth or advance." Though frequently well written, cleverly if artificially devised, and brilliant at times in its satire and wit, the academic drama contains even less poetry than dramatic power. In short, the entire species is amateurish, and isolated to a surprising degree from the great popular drama, its contemporary. And although occasional university men, who had made their reputations at court and in London, — Udall, Preston, Gascoigne, Daniel, Randolph, and Cartwright, — returned to the universities on the royal visits and wrote for academic audiences, no dramatist of the first rank was evolved by either university.[1]

Jonson and Shakespeare at the universities.

Jonson's contact with the universities is a lost chapter, and one that we would fain recover. Was *Volpone* the only one of his plays performed within the sacred precincts? Jonson was "master of arts in both universities, by their favor, not his studies,"[2] and Randolph and Cartwright were among the numerous progeny of his poetical "sons." As to Shakespeare, we have not even this much. *Hamlet* was acted at both Cambridge and Oxford,[3] for Shakespeare's company was often in the latter place. What else

[1] See an admirable passage on the contrast between the English popular drama and the Latin drama in England, the "undistinguished sister to a woman of genius," in Herford, 71.

[2] *Conversations*, 19.

[3] The title-page of the quarto of 1603 is our authority.

did they act on these visits? How did the great poet regard the seat of learning, his frequent stopping-place between London and Stratford? And would he have agreed with his fellow Kemp that the university pens "smelled too much" of "that writer Metamorphosis?" Among the academic plays some few touch subjects treated by Shakespeare. Gascoigne's *Supposes*, taken from the inns of court to Oxford, contains matter used in *The Taming of the Shrew*. There were earlier academic tragedies, as we have seen in *Richard III;* and earlier and later *Cæsars*.[1] There is, too, the academic *Timon* of about 1600, which probably had little if any relation to the Shakespearean play;[2] Dr. Gwinne's use of the Macbeth story in an interlude is five years later;[3] and the fragment of a *Romeus et Julietta* is more wisely regarded as a late imitation of Brooke's old version than in any possible wise a source of Shakespeare.[4] So that, when all has been said, *Lælia*, the Latin translation of *Gl'Ingannati*, remains the only academic play of which we can affirm with certainty that it furnished an immediate source for Shakespeare.

Shakespearean subjects in academic plays.

[1] See above, pp. 21–24.

[2] See Dyce's prefatory remarks to the reprint of this play by the *Shakespeare Society*, 1842; but see, also, W. H. Clemons in *Princeton University Bulletin*, xv, 1904.

[3] *Tres Sibyllæ* printed with *Vertumnus*, 1607. See *Variorum Macbeth*, 397.

[4] Reprinted from the Sloan MS. in *Shakespeare Society's Publications*, 1844. See Fraenkel in *Englische Studien*, xix, 201; Keller, *Englische Studien*, xxxiv, 255, 256, and Fuller, *Modern Philology*, iv, 115.

# XV

## THE ENGLISH MASQUE

HAD Ben Jonson never lived, the English masque would scarcely need to be chronicled among dramatic forms. For despite the fact that mumming, disguising, and dancing in character and costume were pastimes in England quite as old, if not older, than the drama itself, it is to Jonson that we owe the infusion of dramatic spirit into these productions, together with the crystallization of their discordant elements into artistic unity and form. Generically, the masque is one of a numerous progeny, of more or less certain dramatic affiliation. Specifically, a masque is a setting, a lyric, scenic, and dramatic framework, so to speak, for a ball.[1] It is made up of "a combination, in variable proportions, of speech, dance, and song;" and its "essential and invariable feature is the presence of a group of dancers . . . called masquers." [2] These dancers — who range in number from eight to sixteen — are commonly noble and titled people of the court. They neither speak nor sing, nor is it usual to exact of them any difficult or unusual figures, poses, or dances. Their function is the creation of "an imposing show" by their gorgeous costumes and fine presence, enhanced by artistic grouping, and by the aids which decoration and

The masque defined.

The masquers.

[1] Soergel, *Die englischen Maskenspiele*, 1882, p. 14: "die Maske war anfänglich nicht mehr als ein improvisirter Maskenball."

[2] Evans, *The English Masque*, 1897, p. xxxiv.

Professional actors in the masque.

scenic contrivance can lend to the united effect. On the other hand, the speech of the masque, whether of presentation or in dialogue, and the music, both vocal and instrumental, were from the first in the hands of the professional entertainer, and developed as other entertainments at court developed. The masque combined premeditated with unpremeditated parts.

The dances.

The first appearance of the masquers with their march from their "sieges" or seats of state in the scene, and their first dance — all designated the "entry" — was carefully arranged and rehearsed; so also was the return to the "sieges" or "going out," and this preparation included sometimes the preceding dance. The "main," too, or principal dance, was commonly premeditated, as in Jonson's *Masque of Queens*, where the masquers and their torchbearers formed in their gyrations the letters of the name of Prince Charles. Between the "main" and the "going out," two extemporal parts were interpolated, the "dance with the ladies" and the "revels," which last consisted of galliards, corantos, and lavoltas. It was in the development of the "entry" and the "main" that the growth of the masque chiefly consisted.

The nucleus of a masque a dance.

The masque will thus be seen to be distinguished by very certain limitations. Its nucleus is always a dance, as the nucleus of the "entertainment" is a speech of welcome, and that of the "barriers" a sham tournament. Jonson employs these terms with exactitude; [1] but it is not to be supposed that either before

[1] Cf. with Jonson's *Masque of Queens*, his *Entertainment of the Two Kings at Theobalds*, and his *Speeches at Prince Henry's Barriers*. Gifford, *Jonson*, vi, 469 ; and vii, 103 and 147. See, also, Bacon's accurate use of these terms, *Essays*, ed. Wright, 1887, 156–158.

or after Jonson's time was the term masque used with precision. To most of his predecessors and contemporaries a masque meant any revel, masking, or disguising, from a visit such as that of Henry VIII and his courtiers in mask to the palace of Wolsey, immortalized by Shakespeare,[1] to imaginative, mythological interludes like Heywood's *Love's Mistress* or Dekker and Ford's *Sun's Darling*. Indeed, even belated moralities such as the *Microcosmus* of Nabbes were included among masques. In a full recognition of the precise significance of the term masque, we may deny that title, with Soergel and Brotanek, to Milton's beautiful *Comus;* because the dancers and actors are here one and the same persons and not divers as in the true masque.[2] But in view of the looseness of the employment of the word as a term in its day, and the intimate relations of the masque in origin and growth with the numerous *ludi*, disguisings, mummings, and other like entertainments, its predecessors, the subject may be considered here with some latitude, and in no absolute neglect of the various congeners that accompanied it.

Loose contemporary employment of the term.

Congeners of the masque.

It has been customary time out of mind to regard the masque as an exotic by-form of the court entertainment, come out of Italy and introduced to the court of Henry VIII as a choice novelty; [3] and much dependence has been placed on a quotation from Hall, wherein we learn: "On the daie of the Epiphanie at night, the kyng with a XI other wer disguised, after the maner of Italie, called a maske, a

The masque not wholly an Italian or a French innovation;

[1] *Henry VIII*, I, iv.

[2] Soergel, 78; Brotanek, "Die englischen Maskenspiele," *Wiener Beiträge*, XV, 1902, p. x.

[3] Soergel, 12.

thyng not seen afore in Englande."[1] But there is little that seems novel in the description that follows, nor anything that differs in any material respect from other descriptions of like proceedings by Hall, both before and after; unless it be, as has recently been pointed out, a new element of dancing and conversation between the masquers and selected spectators.[2] Brotanek explains that the novelty in this case was in the costume, not in the form of the entertainment. Cunliffe finds the novelty that impressed Hall in the circumstance that the masquers "desired the ladies to daunce," and that the masquers and spectators "daunced and commoned together." As to the foreign influence suggested, these authorities likewise fall apart; Brotanek claiming that it is to France rather than to Italy that we should look for analogues to the later masque; Cunliffe offering many early Italian analogues of Tudor mumming, disguising, and dumb shows.[3] But we need not here look so far afield. The masque in the height of its development falls into two readily distinguishable and contrasted divisions, the first, performed by costumed but unmasked personages, in nature dramatic; while the second, presented almost wholly by the masked and professional participants, is lyrical and musical. Brotanek finds the model for the first in the costumed speeches of welcome and farewell which were offered

[1] Hall, *Chronicle* (1548), ed. 1809, p. 526. This was in the third year of Henry's reign, 1512.

[2] Brotanek, 64–68; Cunliffe, "Italian Prototypes of the Masque and Dumb Show," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xxii, 1907, pp. 140–156. Chambers, i, 401; and *ibid.* 391, on the early connection of the masque with the Feast of Fools, and the *exuviae* worn by the rout of "worshipers at the Kalendae."

[3] Brotanek, 283–302.

its complex vernacular origin.

Queen Elizabeth on her numerous progresses into the provinces of her realm. For the second he takes us back to the masked visitations and dances which had formed a popular variety of courtly amusement from the days of King Edward III downward.[1] Nor does he deny the complex influences of riding, procession, pageantry, and holiday revels in offering models, precedents, and suggestions to this most graceful and effective of dramatic by-forms.

John Lydgate and early mumming.

Interesting as is the subject, none of these origins of the true masque concerns us here, or we might assign to John Lydgate, about 1430, the credit of giving a literary bias to the mumming of his time; trace disguisings into early Tudor days, tell of the rich and elaborate pageantry which sometimes accompanied them there; and dilate on the rejoicings of Christmas, New Year, Twelfth Night, Candlemas, Shrovetide, and May Day, all regarded as naught without masking and disguising.[2] Nor did the maskings of Elizabeth's earlier days differ so much in kind as in degree, although the queen added to the occasions for these shows by her frequent progresses into the provinces, where her nobility vied with her civic entertainers, each to outdo the other in novelty and cost.

The queen's entertainment at Kenilworth, 1575.

If definite points in the development of these forerunners of the masque must be named, one was certainly the elaboration of the Earl of Leicester's devices on the famous occasion of his entertainment of Queen Elizabeth at Kenilworth in 1575.[3] For this

[1] *Ibid.* 138.

[2] On the mummings of Lydgate, see Brotanek, 305; and *Anglia*, xxii, 364; and above, p. 74; and see, especially, the pageants on the betrothal of Prince Arthur and Katharine of Aragon, 1501, *Shakespeare Society's Papers*, i, 47–51.

[3] Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 418–526; and Schelling, *Gascoigne*, 63–71.

purpose some half dozen poets were assembled, among them Gascoigne, Hunnis, and Mulcaster, and the literary and even the dramatic elements were no less a matter of forethought than the feasts and the fireworks. Three years later, when her majesty was entertained at Norwich, we find Thomas Churchyard using comedy as a foil, interspersing amongst his songs and speeches a "dance with timbrels," and "a heavenly noyse of all kinde of musicke," besides employing the device of a canvas cave to effect the sudden appearance and disappearance of nymphs in unexpected places, all of which suggests the grand ensemble of poetry, music, dancing, and stage carpentry in which the later triumphs of Jonson and Inigo Jones were soon to consist.[1] Sir Philip Sidney, too, had his part in the development of dramatic elements in the entertainment and the "barriers" or tournament. In 1578, as the queen was walking in Wansted Garden, Leicester's seat in Waltham Forest, she was regaled with a lively little pastoral idyl, *The Lady of May*, in place of the customary formal speech of welcome. Here was dialogue in prose and contest in song, comic relief in Master Rombus, the pedant, but no dancing.[2] *The Lady of May* is a pastoral, for such was the mode of the moment, and Sidney rode always on the crest of the wave of his time. No less a step in advance were the sumptuous devices accompanying the mock tournament of 1581, likewise referable to the taste and inventive talents of Sidney. The barriers and entertainment thus advanced; the development of the true masque was to come later.

Sidney's *Lady of May*, 1578.

In 1594, "betwixt All-Hollantide and Christmas," was celebrated at Gray's Inn the most elaborate

*Gesta Grayorum*, 1594;

[1] Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii, 180–214. [2] *Ibid.* ii, 94–103.

"Christmasing" of English annals.[1] A "Prince of Purpoole," as he was called, was chosen to rule over the revels, and solemnly surrounded with all the insignia of mock royalty: nobles, counselors, officers, guards, family, and followers. Proclamations, the reception of foreign embassies, the levying of taxes, reception of petitions, creation of knights, even a trial — all were sagely parodied; and this stately fooling was interlarded with feasts, dancing, masking, and at least one play.[2] This last was "a Comedy of Errors, like to Plautus his Menechmus," played by "a company of base and common fellows," who were brought in as a last recourse when things were in confusion and going badly. Wherefore the night "was ever afterwards called the night of errors."[3] But it is the masques of the *Gesta Grayorum* that claim our present attention. They are three: *The Masque of Reconciliation*, wherein was represented the friendship of Graius and Templarius, come to offer sacrifice together upon the altar of the Goddess of Amity; secondly, *The Masque of the Helmet*, a stately allegorical device in which Prince Purpoole's Knights apprehended Envy, Malcontent, and other "monsters and miscreants;" and thirdly, *The Masque of Proteus and the Rock Adamantine*, the composition of Francis Davison, compiler of *The Poetical Rhapsody*, and Thomas Campion, the musician and lyrist.[4] This last was performed before the queen, who graced the

masques of this occasion.

[1] *Ibid.* iii, 262–352. The proceedings really continued until Shrove Tuesday, March 3, 1595.

[2] *Ibid.* 279; and Ward, ii, 27 n.

[3] Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 279–281.

[4] See *ibid*, iii, 281, 297, 309. On the externals of these masques, see Brotanek, 340.

court of Prince Purpoole with her royal presence on Shrovetide evening, 1595. It opens with a hymn in praise of Neptune sung by Nymphs and Tritons attendant on Proteus, who comes to fulfill a pact with the Prince made long since. An Esquire narrates in verse how the Prince, returning along the sea from his victory over the Tartarians, surprised Proteus asleep, and though the sea god assumed various fair and loathsome shapes, succeeded in holding him fast until he promised as ransom to remove the adamantine rock that lies beneath the arctic pole and to transport it whither the Prince might will, assured that "the wild empire of the ocean would follow the rock wherever set." But this is to be fulfilled only on condition that the Prince on his part bring Proteus into the presence of a power "which in attractive virtue" shall "surpass the wonderful force of his iron-drawing rock," the Prince offering that he himself and seven of his knights shall be inclosed within the rock as hostages. The upshot is obvious. Elizabeth's is the "attractive virtue" which draws all hearts. Proteus strikes the rock, and the knights, issuing forth, dance with the ladies their "galliards and courants;" and the performance ends with a second song, "the while the masquers return into the rock."

*The Masque of Proteus* the type of later masques.

Space has been given to the description of this masque because it constitutes the type out of which the later masque was to grow. In both productions the structural order is song, dialogue, and the entry of the masquers, followed by the dances and the closing song. *The Masque of Proteus* well presents, too, the moment of surprise, so effectively to be employed in later times, when the rock opens at the stroke of the "bident" of Proteus and the masquers issue forth.

The accession of James an impetus to the masque.

The entertainments of the latter years of Queen Elizabeth exhibit little that is novel or to any extent contributory to the history of the masque. With the accession of James came a new order of things. The worn and exacting old queen was succeeded by "the British Solomon," with his known penchant for learning and poetry; and the poets and scholars accordingly burst into a chorus of adulation. Nichols lists no less than three and thirty tracts in verse and prose, inspired by the accession and coronation of the new monarch and more than a score of "miscellaneous eulogistic tributes to King James and his family," most of them of the earliest years of his reign.[1] Daniel was early in the field with a lengthy *Panegyric Congratulatory* delivered at Burly-Harington, before James had reached London; and Jonson soon after devised the pageants of the royal welcome in the city and the "*Panegyre*" on the session of the king's first parliament.[2] But neither with these nor with the devices and pageants of his coronation and his progresses, which he continued after the manner of his predecessor, are we here concerned. For with the reign of James begins the speedy development of the masque, which soon outstripped in elegance, elaboration, and artistic value all other entertainments at court. The masques of the reign of King James are no less remarkable for their learned ingenuity than for their originality and splendor; for if the frivolous nature of Queen Anne of Denmark lent them vogue, the pedantry of her royal spouse often determined their character.

In *A Particular Entertainment of the Queen and*

[1] Nichols, *James*, i, p. xxxvii.

[2] *Ibid.* 121; Gifford, *Jonson*, vi, 433. Dekker seems likewise to have been concerned in these pageants.

Jonson's *Entertainment at Althrope*, 1603.

*Prince Henry at Althrope* on their way to join King James, Ben Jonson struck, for the first time, that rich vein of poetic fancy which was to distinguish his more regular masques. His material, a satyr surprised in his haunts by the royal train and a dancing bevy of fairies, contained nothing new.[1] But the dramatic humor of the satyr's altercation with the fairies and their turning on him presaged the antimasque to come. The second masque on this occasion was a slighter affair, in which the old satirical figure of Nobody with the popular morris dance was utilized.[2]

Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, 1604.

The first true masque of the reign was Samuel Daniel's *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, presented at court by the queen and her ladies, January 8, 1604. One end of the presence chamber was fitted to represent a mountain on which was "the Temple of Peace, erected upon four pillars, representing the four virtues, that supported a globe of the earth." About this temple and on the mountain were grouped twelve goddesses and graces from "Juno, in a skycolor mantle embroidered with gold and figured with peacock's feathers," to Tethys, "in a mantle of sea-green, with a silver embroidery of waves and a dressing of reeds," presenting a trident. After an introduction in which Night awakens her son, Somnus, who is sleeping in a cave at the foot of the mountain, Iris descends, delivers a message and a "prospective" (surely a crystal rather than a telescope) to Sibylla, "decked as a nun in black upon white;" and Sibylla, viewing the goddesses as they successively descend in her glass, describes each in fitting verse. All having reached the floor, move in procession to the upper end of the hall

[1] *Ibid.* 439.

[2] Cf. the old comedy of *Nobody and Somebody*, printed in 1606.

before the throne, sing a song, and the dances, alternating with other songs, follow. The masque ends with a return of the masquers to their first position on the mountain.[1] In this masque of Daniel's we have not, as has been maintained, the earliest regular masque, for none of the elements that constitute it are wanting to the two masques of the *Gesta Grayorum* already described.[2] And, besides, with all its allegory, classical lore, costume, tableaux, music, and dancing, the production is void of the least vestige of drama. It was the author of the *Alchemist*, not the author of *Philotas*, who raised the masque to a place in dramatic literature, as it had been those tuneful lyrists, Campion and Davison, who first wrote an English masque in regular form.

Jonson's activity as a deviser of masques at court.

Jonson's career as an entertainer at court began, as we have seen, in the year of the accession of King James. It lasted until 1631, within a few years of the time of his death. During a period of some thirty years Jonson composed no less than nine entertainments, three "barriers," two antimasques, and three and twenty masques proper, these latter constituting more than twice as many as were written by all his competitors and imitators combined. Jonson contributed more than twenty masques to the thirty-seven of James' reign; Campion, Daniel, and perhaps Marston alone, writing more than one each among his rivals.[3] Nor was Jonson's primacy in the masque grounded alone in the quantity of his work.

[1] Grosart, *Daniel*, iii, 204.

[2] Above, pp. 98–101.

[3] The manuscript of the *Masque of Coleorton*, reprinted by Brotanek (328–337), suggests the possibility that some of the private masques of Jonson have perished. He paid no attention to his later works.

His masques are what Daniel's never were — dramatic, — what Chapman's failed to be — genuinely inventive, — what Townsend and Davenant strove for in vain, that is, supereminently poetic. In short, they were rivaled but once by Campion, and by Francis Beaumont, and once again by William Browne.

Classification of the masque.

Several classifications of the masque are possible. We might consider its form, with the growth and degeneracy of the antimasque. We might treat of the masque mainly with reference to its costly and gorgeous performance and the august occasions to which it lent its novel splendors; or we might turn our attention to its material and divide it, with Brotanek, into groups, mythological, astronomical, mythological-allegorical, allegorical-romantic, and allegorical-historical, did not the saving grace of humor forbid.[1] It is safest to tell the story of the Jacobean masque in simple chronological order.

Jonson's *Masque of Blackness*, 1605.

On January 6, 1605, the first of Jonson's masques, *The Masque of Blackness*, was acted at Whitehall. It formed part of Queen Anne's entertainment of the Duke of Holstein, her brother, and on the same day Prince Charles was created Duke of York. Moreover, the queen was herself one of the masquers, and had suggested to Jonson his subject, a masque of blackmoors.[2] On this hint the poet conceived the idea of twelve "negrotes" (the masquers), who appear in mid-ocean, ranged "in an extravagant order" on a floating concave shell, and attended by *Oceaniæ* (the light bearers), by Niger, Oceanus, tritons, and other sea monsters. They are seeking a land, foretold by prophecy, wherein their darkened skins shall be changed to fairness. Britannia is that land, and the

[1] Brotanek, 182–222.

[2] Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 6.

miracle is wrought. Here for the first time is disclosed the scenic art of Inigo Jones, long to be associated with Jonson in such devices. In *The Masque of Blackness*, unlike what had gone before, a regular scene was set at one end of the hall representing "a landscape consisting of small woods," and this "falling," an artificial sea flowed in, "raised with waves which seemed to move. . . . The masquers were placed in a great concave shell like mother of pearl, curiously made to move . . . and rise with the billows," and the horizon, on a level with the stage, was drawn by the lines of perspective.[1] Here was a step in scenic representation, the greatest of its time. Yet be it remembered that Jonson had already alluded familiarly to "a piece of prospective" in *Cynthia's Revels*, acted by the Children of Paul's at least three years before.[2]

Novelty of the setting of this masque by Inigo Jones.

Jonson's next effort was *Hymenæi, or the Solemnities of Masque and Barriers at a Marriage*, that of the young Earl of Essex to Lady Frances, daughter of the Earl of Suffolk. This is one of the most gorgeous and elaborate of entertainments and a departure from precedent in presenting a double set of masquers, the men as Humors and Affections, the ladies as attendants on Juno. In his prefatory words Jonson notes how "royal princes and greatest persons . . . [are in these shows] not only studious of riches and magnificence in outward celebration, . . . but curious after the most high and hearty inventions to furnish the inward parts: and those grounded on antiquity and solid learning." [3] And accordingly

*Hymenæi*, 1606.

[1] *Ibid.* 6–9.

[2] *Cynthia's Revels*, Induction; and see above, p. 173.

[3] Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 45.

he embroiders his page with an elaborately learned commentary on the suggestions which he has gleaned from the classics, a practice which fell in alike with his own taste and that of his learned sovereign, and one which his rivals failed not to mark for the shafts of their wit.[1] *Hymenæi* is an allegory in which the Humors and Affections issuing from a microcosm or globe figuring a man, offer to disturb the rites at Hymen's altar, whereat Reason interferes. Thereupon Juno appears seated in state and splendor above the "rack" of the clouds, Iris and her rainbow beneath with the eight lady masquers, Juno's "powers," as they are termed. These descend from either side of the stage on floating clouds and, joining the Humors and Affections, are reconciled and the rites proceed. Features of this masque were the exceeding richness of the costumes, all described in Jonson's account; [2] the gigantic golden figures of Atlas and Hercules, supporters of the scene; and the surprising mechanism which managed the drifting and descending clouds, and caused the golden globe or microcosm to appear to hang in mid-air and turn on an invisible axle. Elaborate, too, were the music and the dances; and the lyrical excellence of the many songs rises to all but Jonson's highest level in the exquisite *Epithalamion* with which the whole masque concludes. The barriers of the next night included a novel device by which "a mist of delicate perfumes," that is of steam, obscured a part of the stage.[3]

[1] See Daniel's strictures quoted below. *Tethys' Festival*, Grosart, *Daniel*, iii, 305, 306.

[2] Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 70–72.

[3] *Ibid.* 75. This seems to have been a device of the Roman stage

In the following January, Campion's *Masque at Lord Hayes' Marriage*, no unworthy successor to *Hymenæi*, was acted before the king. As might be expected from a musician, Campion gives much attention in his description to the placing of instruments and voices with a view to the musical effect. "On the right hand of 'the skreene' were consorted ten musicians with base and mean lutes, a bandora, a double sack-bote, and an harpsichord, with two treble violins; on the other side somewhat nearer the screen were placed nine violins and three lutes, and to answer both consorts (as it were in a triangle) six cornets and six chapel-voices in a place raised higher in respect to the piercing sound of those instruments." [1] Forty-two instruments and voices supplied the music for this masque. The masque is of Phœbus' Knights turned to golden trees through the wrath of Cynthia. They are freed at last by Night, at the behest of Hesperus, and the trees sink out of sight, a knight clad in green taffety cut into leaves emerging out of each. But, proceeding to the Temple of Night, this habit is plucked off and all appear in resplendent caparison of carnation satin and silver lace.[2] Jones apparently was not the "architect" in this masque. The poetry of Campion is very tuneful and lyrical. The other masque of this year, presented at the Earl of Huntingdon's house of Ashby in honor of his mother, the Countess

Campion's *Phœbus' Knights*, 1607; the elaborate music of this masque.

(see *Pliny*, xxxi, 17), as it is of modern Wagnerian opera. Cf. also, Bacon, *Of Masques and Triumphs:* "Some sweet odours suddenly coming forth, without any drops falling, are . . . things of great pleasure and refreshment." Wright, Bacon's *Essays*, 157.

[1] Bullen, *Campion*, 150.

[2] *Ibid.* 162, 166.

of Darby, is a composite performance by John Marston, and none of it notable.[1]

Jonson's masques of 1608 and 1609.

To 1608 belong two works of Jonson, *The Second Queen's Masque of Beauty* and that which celebrated Lord Haddington's marriage at court, called by Gifford *The Hue and Cry After Cupid.* The latter is a charming adaptation of the well-known *Idyl* of Moschus, so often amplified by the poets, and contains, besides a happy suggestion of the antimasque in "the Sports and pretty Lightnesses that accompany Love," a superb *Epithalamion.*[2] In February, 1609, was acted *The Masque of Queens*, and in it we note a new departure. "And because her majesty (best knowing that a principal part of life, in these spectacles, lay in their variety) had commanded me to think on some dance, or shew, that might precede hers, and have the place of a foil, or false masque; I was careful," says Jonson, "to decline, not only from others, but mine own steps, in that kind ; since the last year, I had an antimasque of boys ; and therefore, now devised that twelve women in habit of hags or witches . . . should fill that part . . . as a spectacle of strangeness, producing multiplicity of gesture and not unaptly sorting with the current and whole fall of the device." [3] Accordingly the scene was set, once more with the help of Jones, to represent "an ugly hell, which flaming beneath, smoked unto the top of the roof," and out of this came forth eleven hags "all differently attired," singing their

*The Masque of Queens*, 1609; the antimasque.

[1] See Bullen, *Marston*, iii, 385.

[2] Cf. Shirley's *Love's Hue and Cry*, and Drayton's *Crier.* Schelling, *Seventeenth Century Lyrics*, 231, and *Elizabethan Lyrics*, 195.

[3] Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 107.

incantations, followed by "a magical dance full of preposterous change and gesticulation." [1] This scene, the first true antimasque, is filled to overflowing with Jonson's recondite and curious learning, and strong with grotesque and virile poetry. For ingenious diablerie with all the horrid appurtenances of their wicked craft, these witches of Jonson are without comparison. Their relation to the witches of *Macbeth* and Middleton might be more difficult to trace than their diverse sources in the classics and in contemporary books on the black art. In the heart of the witches' dance the scene changes to a magnificent building, figuring the House of Fame, wherein were discovered the twelve masquers seated on a triumphal throne. And after a speech from "one in the furniture of Perseus expressing heroic virtue," the throne wherein they sat, "being *machina versatilis*, suddenly changed," and in place of it appeared "Fame, attired in white, with white wings, having a collar of gold about her neck," and described each masquer as she descended, arrayed as a famous queen of history, Penthesilea, Thomyris, Boadicea, and the rest, the last and most glorious being Bel-Anna (royal spouse of James), "of whose dignity and person the whole scope of the invention doth speak throughout." [2]

[1] *Ibid.* 108; and cf. above, i, p. 361.

[2] *Ibid.* 138. A minor ingenuity of this masque was the arrangement of the masquers at one time, "graphically disposed into letters and honoring the name of . . . Charles, Duke of York." *Ibid.* 144. In a later masque, White's *Cupid's Banishment*, 1617, the words "Anna Regina, Jacobus Rex," and "Charles P." were thus "graphically disposed." Bacon dismisses this subject with the words: "Turning dances into figures is a childish curiosity." "Of Masques and Triumphs," *Essays*, 156.

Rivalry of Jonson and Daniel in the masque.

We have seen already above how Jonson, followed by other playwrights, had singled out Samuel Daniel, the accepted poet of the court, as the type of literary affectation, unoriginality, and coxcombry, and how that fastidious scholar and courtier had been satirized again and again on the London stage. We have also noticed both Daniel and Jonson as early rivals for the patronage of the new court.[1] The ten or a dozen years that had elapsed since Jonson first represented Daniel as Master Matthew and Fastidious Brisk had wrought a change in the relative positions of the two poets. Daniel, now one of the grooms of her majesty's privy chamber, had continued his epical and lyrical activity, had been chosen to write, as we have also seen, the first of the royal masques at court, and had reached his greatest success in his pastoral, *The Queen's Arcadia*, acted during the royal visit to Oxford in the summer of 1605.[2] But Jonson within the same period had become one of the foremost of the popular dramatists, and had supplanted Daniel as the accepted entertainer at court. Now in the very year of Jonson's popular triumph, *The Alchemist*, Daniel made a final attempt to regain his lost prestige at court, and elected to try to excel his younger rival in that rival's own chosen field. Jonson had never been unconscious of his own merit, nor loath to explain to the world how all his work "was grounded upon antiquity and solid learning," so that when he received a gracious command from Prince Henry "to retrieve the particular authorities to those things which I writ out of fulness and memory of my former readings," the delighted poet did not hesitate to embroider the margin of his *Masque of Queens* with

[1] Cf. above, i, p. 478; ii, p. 101. [2] On this, see below, p. 156.

an erudite and most elaborate commentary. To this weakness of his rival Daniel alludes somewhat splenetically in the *Preface* to his *Tethys' Festival*, calling the makers of masques "ingeners for shadows" who "frame only images of no result," and deprecating the conduct of those who "fly to an army of authors as idle as themselves." And he thanks God that he labors not "with that disease of ostentation." [1]

*Tethys' Festival*, 1610;

*Tethys' Festival or the Queen's Wake* was celebrated June 5, 1610, on the occasion of Prince Henry's creation Prince of Wales. It was the concluding solemnity of several days of royal ceremonial in which Jonson took his part as the author of the allegorical entertainment at the Barriers, where the Lady of the Lake, Prince Arthur, and Merlin all welcomed the heir to the British crown to the honors of the tilt and of knighthood.[2] For Daniel's masque Inigo Jones devised three changes of scene, a haven and castle with ships moving at sea, the golden and gem-studded caverns of Tethys and her nymphs, and lastly an artificial grove. Novel features were the rich golden settings for the scenes, the first made up of figures of Neptune and Nereus, on pedestals twelve feet high, embossed with other figures of silver and gold; the use of artificial fountains and the employment of a device of circles of moving lights which "so occupied the eyes of the spectators that the manner of altering the scenes was scarcely observed." [3] Daniel's own invention included what he called an "ante-maske or first scene," the appearance of

[1] Jonson's dedication to Prince Henry, Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 104; Grosart, *Daniel*, iii, 305.

[2] *Prince Henry's Barriers*, Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 149.

[3] Grosart, *Daniel*, iii, 315.

Zepherus and eight tiny naiads of the fountain, acted by the young Duke of York (later Charles I), then ten years of age, and eight little maids of the court; and "the main appearance of Tethys and her nymphs of the several rivers," who make offering to a tree of Victory. A novel departure was the later appearance of the queen and her ladies, this time in their own shapes. The incidental poetry is graceful and adequate, as was to be expected of the author of *Delia*, but the design is uncertain and the allegory incoherent. With a last thrust at Jonson and the professional aid which *The Masque of Queens* must have required, Daniel prides himself on the circumstance that "there were none of inferior sort mixed amongst these great personages of state and honor (as usually there have been), but all was performed by themselves with a due reservation of their dignity." [1]

acted only by "great personages."

Great expense in the performance of masques.

As may be supposed, the cost of these entertainments was often very great. Two contemporaries declare that Jonson's *Masque of Blackness* drew £3000 out of the Exchequer.[2] His *Masque* at the marriage of Viscount Haddington cost twelve gentlemen contributors each the sum of £300. But it seems that in both these estimates the cost of the entire entertainment, supper, and wines must have been included.[3] The total cost of Jonson's *Love Freed from Ignorance* amounted to £719 1*s*. 3*d*. Jonson received £40 of this sum "for his invention," Inigo Jones as much "for his paynes and invention,"

[1] *Ibid.* 323. [2] Nicholas, *James*, i, 468, 469.

[3] *Ibid.* ii, 175. Cf. the expense of Lord Hay's masque in honor of the French ambassador in 1616, which cost, the supper included, £2200; and Bacon's expenditure of £2000 on the *Masque of Flowers*, 1613.

while Mr. Confesse, "for teaching all the dances," was paid £50. Boys who acted Cupid and the Graces received each two pounds; mere "fooles that danced, one pound." [1] If cost, then, be evidence of splendor, Daniel's *Tethys*, reckoned at £1600, exceeded the cost of its immediate successor, just mentioned, by more than as much again. From a contemporary letter it appears that the court was not without its difficulties in raising the requisite ready money for these expensive revels; and the mention that the queen would spend but some £600 on two masques that year (1610–1611) seems to indicate an intention to retrench in this direction.[2] Whatever the facts, the next three masques of Jonson contain no such elaborate descriptions as to scene and costume, though each develops the dramatic possibilities of the antimasque. In *Love Freed from Ignorance* (December 15, 1610), Cupid, bound by Sphynx, is beset by the Follies and She-Fools and rescued by the Muses, who supply his bewildered godship with the answer to the Sphynx's riddle. *Oberon, the Fairy Prince* (January 1, 1611), opens with a vivacious antimasque between Sylvanus and several satyrs who gibe the sleeping Sylvans, guards of Oberon's temple; [3] but less is made of fairy-lore than might have been expected of the author of *The Sad Shepherd*. Lastly, in *Love Restored* (January 6, 1612), Jonson boldly opens with a lively little piece of realistic farce in

Jonson's masques of 1610–12.

[1] Collier, *Life of Jones*, 11.

[2] John More to Sir Ralph Winwood, 1610, Nicholas, *James*, ii, 371. One of these masques was certainly Jonson's *Love Freed from Ignorance;* the identity of the other is not certain. See Brotanek, 345.

[3] For the date of this masque, see the discussion of Brotanek, 346.

which Robin Goodfellow satirically recounts the difficulties of a plain man's access to a masque. We have here a picture, doubtless only too true to the life, of the confusion and petty intrigues that attended a royal masque at Whitehall. Masquerado, who would "make them a show himself," is not impossibly Daniel once more; but the sketch is much too slight to make the identification at all certain. But one other masque belongs to this immediate period, the anonymous *Masque of the Twelve Months*, acted doubtless in January, 1612.[1] Here, after a humorous dialogue between Pigwiggen, a fairy, and Madge Howlet, the twelve spheres descend and call Beauty from her fortress, represented as a huge heart. From this, opening, there issues forth not only Beauty, but Aglaia attended by "the two Pulses." An antimasque of pages follows, a second "of moones like huntresses with torches in their hands," and a species of grotesque *pas de seul* by a personage called Prognostication. At length the masquers descend, arrayed to signify the twelve months, and "Somnus, hovering in the air," sings the final song. The variety of this masque, though it is not badly written, is its chief claim to consideration.

*Masque of the Twelve Months.*

On November 6, 1612, Prince Henry died, and the makers of masques had cause to lament the loss of a liberal patron. Jones lost his surveyorship of the Prince's works, and went once more to Italy to pursue the wider study of art and architecture; and Jonson, despairing of immediate employment at

Death of Prince Henry, a temporary abatement of the masque, 1612.

[1] Brotanek very properly rearranges the order of this masque as printed by Collier (*Life of Jones*, 131–142), so that the dialogue between Pigwiggen and Howlet comes first, the masque with which the manuscript opens following.

court, accepted the post of tutor to the son of Sir Walter Raleigh and traveled with his charge into France.[1] But the sorrow of James' court was short-lived. Before two months had expired the court was agog with flutter and expectation of the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth to the Palsgrave, and masques were once more preparing and practicing.

Grand masques of the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth, 1613:

This is not the place in which to recount the extraordinary celebrations — the sea fights and fireworks, the royal passages, triumphs, and ceremonials — that accompanied this august event. Among them were three notable masques, not furnished by queen or prince as customary heretofore, but by lords of the court and gentlemen of the several inns of court, and vying in elaboration, if not in expense, with the royal masques themselves. On the evening of the marriage, February 14, *The Lords' Masque* of Thomas Campion was given, and the talents of Jones were once more enlisted. The scene was changed no less than four times, the last representing "a prospective with porticoes on each side which seemed to go in a great way." [2] Two antimasques appeared, the first of "franticks," the second of "fierie spirits," the torchbearers, and the masquers were stars and golden statues called to life. Campion's masque is full of graceful poetry, and must have been especially rich and novel in its music. On the following evening the gentlemen of the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn assembled at the house of Sir Edward Philips, Master of the Rolls, and proceeded in mask in a grand procession of horsemen and cars triumphal, attended

Campion's *Lords' Masque;*

Chapman's masque;

[1] Collier, *Life of Jones*, 14, 16; *Conversations with Drummond*, 21.

[2] Bullen, *Campion*, 205.

by two hundred halberdiers in a show, "novel, conceitful and glorious," to the court at Whitehall. There they presented a rich and ponderous allegorical masque, "blind and deformed Plutus, made sightly, ingenious and liberal by the love of Honor," the composition of George Chapman, "*Homeri Metaphrastes*." Chapman's antimasques were of baboons and torchbearers, their torches lighted at each end. His masquers were clothed as "Virginian priests," called the "Phœbades," and the scene represented the heart of "a refulgent mine of gold," and again a vast and hollowed tree, "the bare receptacle of the baboonerie." Chapman is very indignant, in his *Description*, concerning "certain insolent objections made against the length of my speeches and narrations." Yet, with every esteem for Chapman's art, we cannot but sympathize, on the perusal of his masque, with the "vulgarly-esteemed upstarts" who appear to have dared thus "to break the dreadful dignity of antient and autenticall Poesie." [1]

Beaumont's masque.

*The Masque of the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn* had come to Whitehall by land; it was planned that the *Masque of the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn* should move up the Thames from Winchester House in a gallant flotilla, with lights, music, and peals of ordnance on the following evening. And this was partly carried out, though by reason of the crowd (albeit farthingales were forbidden the feminine spectators), and the fagged condition of the court, this masque was postponed until Saturday, February 20.[2] An unusual interest attaches to this production, as it was the composition of Francis Beau-

[1] See the poet's words, Nicholas, *James*, ii, 571, 572.

[2] *Ibid.* 589, 590.

mont, and was aided and abetted in chief by Sir Francis Bacon, then King James' solicitor-general. Bacon's interest in such entertainments was of long standing, and we have seen him as far back as 1587, a student of Gray's Inn, devising "dumbe shewes" for a Senecan tragedy, while his familiar essay, *Of Masques and Triumphs*, from its allusions doubtless written soon after the events on which we are now engaged, is a complete epitome in little of the lore as to "these toys," as wisdom must ever term them.[1] As to Beaumont, it may be remarked that he wrote this masque as a member of the Inner Temple and about the time of his retirement from writing for the popular stage, a retirement not improbably due to his marriage with a lady of station. The *Masque* begins with an altercation between Mercury and Iris, messengers of Jupiter and Juno, in which each presents a rival antimasque; the main masque introduces the Olympian Knights to do honor to these nuptials on their way to revive the ancient Olympian games. A new departure is the habiting of both the antimasques, not "in one kind of livery (because that had been so much in use heretofore), but, as it were, in consort [that is diversely], like to broken music."[2] The setting presented nothing novel. Beaumont's lines are full of life and beauty. Nor is

Bacon as a patron of the masque.

[1] See above, p. 102; in 1592 Bacon wrote speeches for a *Device* presented to the queen when entertained by Essex at Twickenham Park; he contributed six prose speeches to the *Gesta Grayorum* in 1595 and in the same year wrote further speeches for the same earl's entertainment of the queen on the anniversary of her accession. Bacon was "the chief contriver" of Beaumont's masque, 1613; and the chief "encourager" of *The Masque of Flowers* in the next year.

[2] Nichols, *James*, ii, 592.

the dramatist wholly lost in the occasional poet. This was Beaumont's only masque.

Campion's later masques.

In Jonson's absence Campion gained a brief vogue. He was called on by Lord Knowles to entertain the queen in the following April, on her progress, at Cawsome House, and joined a simple masque to many speeches and songs of welcome and praise.[1] And he furnished, too, the nuptial masque for the ill-starred union of Robert Carr, Earl of Somerset, with the divorced wife of the Earl of Essex, December 26, 1613.[2] Here, again, the antimasque is made up of a variety of vices, winds, elements, countries, and other abstractions, and a grotesque dance of twelve skippers is inserted just before the conclusion. A feature of the setting, which was the work not of Jones, but of one Constantine de Servi, was a scene of London with the Thames, and the masquers departed on four "barges" that apparently floated away. "I hear little or no commendation of the masque made by the Lords that night, either for device or dancing," says the Lord Chamberlain, "only it was rich and costly." [3] But Jonson had already returned, and furnished the sprightly little *Challenge at Tilt* for a further celebration of this marriage next day. Two days later, he furnished *The Irish Masque*, which is no more than a humorous dialogue between four Irish footmen in broken English followed by songs in praise of the king, sung by Irish bards. But it pleased the king and was ordered again for January 3. The final solemnity of Somerset's marriage was *The Masque of Flowers*, the work of three gentlemen of Gray's Inn, acted by

*The Masque of Flowers*, 1614.

[1] Bullen, *Campion*, 173. [2] *Ibid.* 211.
[3] Nicholas, *James*, ii, 725.

their fellows and discharged as to cost by Sir Francis Bacon, who was said to have expended thereon no less a sum than £2000.[1] The antimasque is a duel between Silenus and Kawasha (who appears to be the god of smoke) as to the superior worthiness of wine or tobacco, "to be tried at two weapons, at song and at dance," followed by the now customary dance of various characters, here realistically transplanted from the streets of London. The masque unites Winter and Spring in the celebration of this union, and a charm transforms a gorgeous garden laden with bloom into the group of masquers. "The masque ended, it pleased his Majesty to call for the anticke-mask of song and daunce, which was again presented; and then the maskers, [all of them gentlemen of the Inn,] uncovered their faces, and came up to the state, and kissed the King's and Queen's and Prince's hands with a great deal of grace and favor, and so were invited to the banquet." [2]

Jonson's masques, 1615-18.

With the coming of the next New Year we find Jonson once more firmly established as the accepted writer of masques for the court; and for four succeeding years (1615 to 1618 inclusive) each January witnessed a masque of his at Whitehall; whilst one private masque and two independent antimasques (all within the same period) attest alike his activity and his inventiveness. *Mercury Vindicated from the Alchemists* (1615) opens with a humorous scene in which that lithe deity escapes from the furnace of Vulcan. The antimasques are of "thread-bare

[1] Chapman's *Masque* had cost Lincoln's Inn alone £1086 8*s.* 11*d.* See Dugdale, *Origines Juridiciales*, 1671, 286, for particulars of the assessments.

[2] Nicholas, *James*, ii, 745.

alchemists" and "imperfect creatures with helms of limbecks on their heads." [1] *The Golden Age Restored* (1616) is a beautiful fancy in which Pallas turns the Iron Age and his attendant evils to statues which sink out of sight. It is one of the most poetical of Jonson's masques. *The [Anti] Masque of Christmas* (1616) is a piece of drollery in which that jolly personage introduces his sons and daughters, among them Carol, Wassel, and Minced-pie. In it Cupid (who forgets his part) and his mother Venus, a deaf tire-woman, also figure. In *The Vision of Delight* and in *Lovers Made Men* (both 1617), Jonson returned to more normal forms. *Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue* (1618) is of interest alike for the extraordinary scene in which Altas is represented "in the figure of an old man, his head and beard all hoary and frost as if his shoulders were covered with snow;" [2] and from the opening entry of Comus, "the god of cheer or the belly," a personage who may well have conveyed a hint to an impressionable child of ten named John Milton. King James was so pleased with this masque that he ordered it repeated, like each of its three predecessors; [3] and for the second performance Jonson wrote an additional antimasque which he called *For the Honor of Wales*.

The character Comus.

But it was not alone at court that the masque continued to flourish. In January, 1615, William Browne of Tavistock, the tuneful pastoralist and lyric poet, furnished the Inner Temple with one of the most exquisite works of this kind, and the only masque from his pen.[4] Aside from the beauty of its poetry,

William Browne's *Ulysses and Circe*, 1615.

[1] Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 237, 240. [2] *Ibid.* 299.
[3] Brotanek, 351–353.
[4] Entitled *The Inner Temple Masque*, and first printed in 1772.

Browne's masque is distinguished by a coherence of plot almost unexampled among masques. The fable is that of Ulysses and Circe. The first scene — so Browne calls it — is the Sirens' rock, the second a grove on Circe's Island. One antimasque is appropriately the beast-men of Circe's transformation, another the maids that gather Circe's "simples." But it is not the beast-men that Ulysses transforms to their human shape with the wand of the enchantress, but his companions, the masquers, whom he arouses, asleep in a glorious enchanted arbor. Even metaphorically, Browne could not call his fellow Templars beasts, so the fable was sacrificed. Another private masque of this period was that presented on Candlemas night, February 8, 1618, at Coleoverton, by the Earl of Essex and his friends. The verse of this masque is fluent and not wanting in poetry. It was written under Jonson's influence, if indeed he is not the author of it himself, as Brotanek thinks.[1] *Cupid's Banishment* by Robert White was a ladies' masque presented to the queen at Greenwich in May, 1617; a like production, in which Lady Hay with eight others were to have appeared as Amazons, was "disliked and disallowed by the queen" in the following year.[2] On February 2, 1618, *The Mountebank's Masque* was acted at Gray's Inn and repeated before the king a few days later at court. This masque contains the lengthy drollery of a mountebank and one Dr. Paradox, but is not otherwise conspicuous. Fleay seems conclusively to have

Other masques by various hands.

[1] Brotanek, 218, and 353; also 328–337, where the masque is reprinted.

[2] Letter from John Chamberlain to Sir Dudley Carlton, January, 1618, quoted by Collier, i, 409. No trace of this masque remains. See Fleay, ii, 343.

answered Collier's ascription of it to Marston by showing that the masque forms part of the *Gesta Grayorum* of 1617, and that Marston belonged to the Temple.[1] So, too, Middleton's one *Masque of the Inner-Middle Temple* (otherwise *The Masque of Heroes*, January 1, 1619) offers nothing unusual save a coarse, if well-written, scene between Doctor Almanac and various Days of the year, fantastically set forth. A novel feature of the contemporary edition is a table of five principal professional actors, among which number are the playwright, William Rowley, and Joseph Taylor, successor to Burbage as the most important actor of the King's company.[2]

Inigo Jones and his quarrel with Jonson.

Late in 1615 Inigo Jones had returned from abroad to enjoy the reversion of the office of surveyor of the king's works, which he had long been promised and which had lately fallen in; and for some years we hear little of his employment in connection with the masque.[3] He was busy with more important projects, building and designing for the king. Moreover, after the gorgeous heights which masking reached at the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth, there was a perceptible falling off in the expense and elaboration of these entertainments. To this period, too, belongs the breach between Jonson and Jones, which was certainly complete as early as 1619, in which year Jonson reported to Drummond that "when he wanted to express the greatest villaine in the world, he would

[1] Collier, *Jones*, xviii; Fleay, ii, 82, 344.

[2] *Historia Histrionica* (1699), ed. Dodsley-Hazlitt, xv, 405.

[3] Jones seems to have assisted Jonson in *Love Freed from Ignorance*, the *Christmas* antimasque in *Oberon*, *Neptune's Triumph*, and *Pan's Anniversary*, though Jonson acknowledged his share only in the last.

call him ane Inigo."[1] The causes of this quarrrel are not clear, and it was certainly patched up for a time, as Jonson and Jones collaborated in the masques of the last years of King James. Queen Anne died in March, 1619, and masques at court were intermitted for a time. But after his return from Scotland, whither he had gone afoot on his well-known pilgrimage in the summer of this year, Jonson took up once more his avocation as maker of court masques. Brotanek has assigned *Pan's Anniversary or The Shepherds' Holiday* to the king's birthday, June 19, 1620.[2] It is distinguished by its many beautiful lyrics, abiding proofs of the vital poetical spark in "old Ben." The New Year of 1621 was celebrated with a return to masking in the slight and fanciful performance, *News from the New World Discovered in the Moon;* and in August came one of the greatest of Ben Jonson's triumphs, *The [Anti] Masque of Gypsies*, celebrated at Burley-on-the Hill, the seat of the favorite Buckingham, at Belvoir and at Windsor, each time to the exceeding delight of the king, and to the enrichment of Jonson by £100 and an increased pension. This masque is vulgar and ribald to a degree beyond any product of its class; but it is admirably vivacious and humorous as well. Like *Ignoramus*, and for a similar reason, it exactly fitted the royal taste, and is said even to have inspired the long dormant muse of his Majesty to the composition of certain verses.[3] In *The Masque of Augures*, acted in January and May, 1622, Jonson again made much of the vulgar, realistic present in antimasques of

Jonson's last group of masques.

*The Masque of Gypsies*, 1621

[1] *Conversations*, 30. [2] Brotanek, 357.

[3] Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 453 n.; and see as to *Ignoramus*, above, pp. 78, 79.

"neighbors from St. Katherens," and Urson and his bears. *Time Vindicated*, of the next January, was given with unusual splendor, but one of the anti-masques had degenerated into a dance of tumblers and jugglers. *Neptune's Triumph for the Return of Albion*, projected for January 6, 1624, to celebrate the return of Prince Charles and Buckingham from their futile and vainglorious trip into Spain for a royal spouse, was postponed again and again, and finally abandoned;[1] although much of its material was worked over into *The Fortunate Isles*, presented on Twelfth Night, 1624, to celebrate the betrothal of Prince Charles to Henrietta Maria.

Characteristic of the Jacobean masque; the nature of its allegory.

From the foregoing sketch of the masque in the reign of King James several things are derivable. We have, first, the stubborn persistence of allegory, seldom well sustained, it is true, but none the less pervading. The allegorical nature of the masque is its oldest inheritance, one that comes direct from the time-honored practices of the morality. When we consider the stern grip of allegory on the literature of generations that had gone before, how its coloring of the drama was only one manifestation of a tincture that dyed in its vivid colors the religion, the architecture, and pictorial art of the time, the masque assumes a new interest as the last flicker of expiring medieval art.[2] The allegory of the morality was didactic; that of the masque eulogistic and artistic. The allegory of the morality was often intellectually subtile. That of the masque was simpler

[1] *Ibid.* viii, 451, Cunningham's note; and Brotanek, 359.

[2] In pageantry such as that of the Lord Mayors' shows alone did this obvious allegory of old time persist any later. See Fairholt, *Lord Mayors' Pageants.*

and appealed — sometimes grossly — to the senses. The allegory of the Jacobean masque is rarely over-ingenious, and the use of the allegory of double relation, — like that of the *Faery Queen* and the dramas of Lyly, — in which a given story has alike a reference to abstract qualities and their concrete embodiment in certain well-known personages, had become practically a matter of the past. In a word, the ponderous and complete allegory of the middle ages, in which every item is figured forth with keen and tireless ingenuity, has been replaced by the delicate art of poetical suggestion, wherein allusion, hidden significance, and the force of subtle similitude are plain to the cultivated gentleman, an intimate in the charmed circle of the court, but a blank to ignorance and outside impertinence. It was the recognition of this that prompted Jonson's words in the *Masque of Queens*, where, excusing himself for not making certain of his personages "their own decipherers," he says: "To have made . . . each one to have told upon their entrance what they were and whither they would, had been a most piteous hearing, and utterly unworthy every quality of a poem: wherein a writer should trust somewhat to the capacity of the spectator, especially in these spectacles; where men, beside inquiring eyes, are understood to bring quick ears, and not those sluggish ones of porters and mechanics, that must be bored through with narrations." [1]

Classical personages, imagery, and allusions in the Jacobean masque.

A second characteristic of the masque is a profuse employment of classical material in its personages, its imagery, and allusion. This it shared with many other species of the drama, thus falling in with

[1] Gifford, *Jonson*, vii, 113 n.

an all but universal mannerism of the age. Nor did the masque, despite the classical learning of its authors, hesitate to follow the popular drama in mingling satire, abstraction, and the personages of every-day life with the stately gods of ancient Greece and Rome. Jonson and Chapman are deep in their show of classical learning. Yet it was Browne who achieved the one thoroughly successful masque on classical story, his masque of *Ulysses and Circe*. And this is explained by a third characteristic of the Jacobean masque, its general lack of definite plot or design; and outside of Browne and Jonson, once more, its common want even of any certain central idea.

Importance of Inigo Jones and of Jonson to the growth of the masque.

The scenic effects and contrivances with which these amusements of the court were staged have already been indicated by reference and example in the preceding paragraphs. It is notable that this outburst of display and ingenuity is referable to one man, Inigo Jones, and is only one of several activities in which he was famous in his time. On the other hand, as already made plain, the lyric and dramatic development of the masque was almost as solely Jonson's. The antimasque, as we have seen, was his invention, and he, nearly alone, attempted to preserve this feature from degeneracy into mere buffoonery and nonsense. From a foil to the masque which followed it, the antimasque became almost any light or farcical preceding scene and was actually described by Daniel as an "ante-masque." The later confusion of the word with "anticke-masque" further illustrates the degeneracy already alluded to.[1]

Degeneracy of the antimasque.

[1] Cf. the use of the word in *The Masque of Queens*, *ibid.* 107, with *Tethys' Festival*, Grosart, *Daniel*, iii, 311, and *The Masque of Flowers*, Nichols, *James*, ii, 739. See, also, Brotanek, 139–169.

When the idea of contrast was lost in the antimasque and that of mere diversion substituted, three changes soon took place: the introduction of a second — in the next reign, even of a third and fourth — antimasque; [1] secondly, a change from the group of characters of one kind, such as Jonson's witches or his satyrs or cyclops, to the medley of personages which we meet in Beaumont; and lastly the development of scenes of drollery in dialogue and the infusion into the antimasque of the element of satire. For this last Jonson and the taste of his master must be held largely responsible. But in *The Masque of Mountebanks* and in Middleton's *Masque of Heroes* as well as in Jonson's *Love Restored*, *Augures*, and *News from the New World*, the interest is chiefly of this kind; though Jonson alone wrote productions such as *Christmas* and *The Gypsies' Metamorphosis*, in which the antimasque has usurped all.

The satirical element.

Lastly, as to the Jacobean masque, it should be remembered that it remained, as earlier, only one form — though the most sumptuous — of the many entertainments in which the age abounded. The royal progresses continued, though more serious addresses had taken much of the function of the old allegorical welcome; and complete dramas, in Latin and English, pastoral or other, often supplied the place formerly occupied by the "entertainment." Prince Charles, like his brother, had his celebrations, though the tournament was becoming more and

Place of the masque among other Jacobean entertainments;

[1] In *The Masque of the Twelve Months* the antimasquers dance several times. Both Chapman's and Beaumont's masques of 1613 have two antimasques. Jonson apparently borrowed the device for the first time in *Mercury Vindicated*, 1615.

more a thing of the past.[1] It was in civic ceremonial that the entertainment, with its pageantry and allegory, its songs and speeches, still preserved the customs of old time. Of the Lord Mayors' Pageants, which were held yearly between 1580 and 1639, more than thirty remain extant and in print, the work of such well-known poets as Peele, Munday, Dekker, Middleton, and Heywood, nearly all of whom with Webster, Marston, and Shirley were the authors likewise of other monologues, dialogues, and speeches of welcome.[2] Indeed, Jonson's own little monologue, *The Masque of Owls*, discloses that his poetical activity in this kind was by no means confined to the statelier productions of the court.[3] Besides this, the masque came more and more to influence the general drama, not only in setting and staging, but dramas enlivened with masque-like features became the favorites of the hour. A recent authority states that there are "distinct masque elements in sixteen" of Beaumont and Fletcher's plays.[4] Middleton, Field, Tourneur, and others used the masque more or less organically in their dramas.[5] In Shakespeare's comedies masking may be said to be almost a favorite device, from the Muscovite disguises, the pageant of the nine worthies,

its influence on the drama.

The masque in Shakespeare.

[1] Cf. *Civitatis Amor*, an entertainment by water, by Middleton, 1616; Bullen, *Middleton*, vii, 267.

[2] See Fairholt, *Lord Mayors' Pageants*, *Percy Society*, 1843. Greg, *List of Masques, Pageants*, etc., 1902, adds several titles to Fairholt's list.

[3] This was acted before Prince Charles in 1624; Gifford, *Jonson*, viii, 454.

[4] Thorndike, "Influence of Court Masques on the Drama," *Modern Language Publications*, n. s. viii, 116.

[5] *Women Beware Women*, *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's*, *Woman is a Weathercock*, and *The Revenger's Tragedy*, all contain

and the dialogue of Winter and Summer, all contained in *Love's Labour's Lost*, to the elves and fays of *The Merry Wives*, *Hymen's Masque* in *As You Like It*, and the more striking examples of the later plays.[1] Thus, besides the scene representing the historical masking of Henry VIII, this entire play was sumptuously staged to represent the ceremonials and pomp of court. *The Winter's Tale* contains an antic-dance of twelve satyrs; *The Tempest* a betrothal masque in which the familiar classical goddesses figure, besides an antimasque of "strange shapes." *Cymbeline* has thrust into its final act a dream (composite of ghosts and Jupiter, who "descends on an eagle") which nothing but a degenerate taste for such stage devices could justify or excuse.[2] An instance of direct borrowing from a masque has been alleged in the case of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, in which a motley group of masquers, including a taborer, a bavian, and five wenches, — somewhat like the antimasque of Beaumont's *Masque* of 1613, — dance a morris.[3] But neither this identification nor the theory which credits Shakespeare with borrowing the idea of the

masking, as do Fletcher's *Maid's Tragedy*, *Maid in the Mill*, and many more. See, also, Soergel's long list of plays in which masking occurs, 88–89. Shirley asks, in *Love in a Maze* (iv, 2), apropos of the masque, —

> "What plays are taking without these
> Pretty devices? . . .
> Your dance is the best language of some comedies
> And footing runs away with all."

[1] *Love's Labour's Lost*, v, ii; *Merry Wives*, v, v; *As You Like It*, v, iv. On this topic, see, also, H. Schwab, *Das Schauspiel im Schauspiel*, 1896.

[2] *Winter's Tale*, iv, iv; *Tempest*, iii, iii; iv, i; *Cymbeline*, v, iv.

[3] Littledale, ed. of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 145, *Shakspere Society's Publications*, 1876.

antic-dance of satyrs in *The Winter's Tale* from Jonson's *Oberon, the Fairy Prince*, seems altogether warranted to those whose sensitiveness as to the eternal likeness of things is not developed into too serious a disproportion with their faith in the resources of genius.[1]

Last of Ben Jonson's masques.

There seems no reason to suppose that Jonson was superseded as the entertainer at court in the earliest years of King Charles' reign.[2] Masking was dropped for a season; but on its resumption, in 1631, Jonson is found once more in his familiar place. He had been ill meanwhile, and his years were pressing upon him. Charles had sent the old poet a gift of £100 in 1629, and in the next year employed him on *Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, which was performed with great splendor, January 9, 1631, the king himself heading the masquers in the rôle of Heroick Love. So successful was this masque that a queen's masque, *Chloridia*, was ordered to follow, and was acted by her majesty and her ladies late in the succeeding month. But this was the last of Jonson's masques. In both Inigo Jones had assisted. But the quarrel between Jones and Jonson, both of them now old and irascible, broke out anew, and, in the next year, Aurelian Townsend, a small poet and one time "son of Ben," was invited to supply the words to two inventions of Jones. These were *Albion's Triumph*, allegorically representing London and the English court, presented January 8, 1632, and *Tempe Restored*, relating the story of Circe and her lovers, February 14, following. Townsend's verses are graceful and far from devoid of merit, and

[1] Thorndike, *Masques*, 118.

[2] Gifford, *Jonson*, Memoir i, p. cxxix.

Jonson's unhappy attacks on Inigo did not include his coadjutor.[1] Jonson's quarrel need not concern us. He was ill, "confined to bed and board," deprived by his rival of his chiefest means of a livelihood. But the old lion was not yet dead, nor had all his patrons deserted him. On the royal progress into Scotland in 1633, Charles was sumptuously entertained by the literary Duke and Duchess of Newcastle at Welbeck in Nottinghamshire, and again in the summer of 1634, by the same hosts at Bolsover; and for both Jonson prepared the devices of *Love's Welcome*. In the latter the persistent old satirist dared to gibbet his foe once more as Coronel Vitruvius. And although both king and court must have wearied of this petty quarrel of two testy old men, there seems no reason to doubt that Charles was both forbearing and kind to the infirmities of his broken old poet.[2]

Shirley's *Triumph of Peace*, 1634.

As for Jones, he proceeded on to his greatest triumphs of scenic ingenuity, marked in the two court masques of the year 1634. The first of these was Shirley's *Triumph of Peace*, given February 3, "the most magnificent pageant ever perhaps exhibited in England," a procession and masque in which the four inns of court united to honor their king and to show their detestation of the tenets of Prynne and such as thought with him, recently set forth in the notorious diatribe, *Histriomastix*.[3] *The Triumph of Peace* is

[1] See *An Expostulation with Inigo Jones* and the two epigrams that follow it. Gifford, *Jonson*, viii, 109–115.

[2] See the two letters of James Howell to Jonson on this subject, Jacobs, *Howell*, 325, 376.

[3] Dyce, *Shirley*, i, p. xxiii. This masque was repeated by the king's command, February 11, in Merchant Taylors' Hall. A

a monster masque, alike for its size and the incongruous elements which its designers, in their search after novelty, saw fit to unite in it. The main idea seems no more than the descent of Peace and Law and Justice to do honor to King Charles and his queen. But about this are clustered no less than seven changes of scene from street, tavern, and forest to the sinking of the moon in an open landscape and the rise of Amphiluche, the harbinger of morning. There were eight antimasques, a rapid succession of character dances, of abstractions, birds, thieves, huntsmen, projectors, beggars, and what not. There were little scenes of humor and folly, a knight tilting at a windmill, four dotterels captured by mimicry, nymphs beset by satyrs; and at one point the carpenter, tailor, painter, and tire-women invade the scene in an unexpected bit of pleasantry. Shirley names more than twenty principal characters in a list prefixed as taking part, but the text discloses at least sixty more, besides musicians, torchbearers, and chorus. Shirley's verse and prose is abundantly adequate to the slender demands of such a performance. The scene, costume, and ornament was Inigo Jones', the music that of William Lawes, the famous composer. A contemporary estimate gives the total cost of the masque to the four societies as "above twenty thousand pounds." [1]

Carew's *Cœlum Britannicum*, 1634.

In less than a week the court gave a return masque to this of the inns of court, and Thomas Carew, the king's "sewer in ordinary" or cup-bearer, in association with Lawes and Jones, contrived *Cœlum*

ballad on the procession preceding it is reprinted in Maidment-Logan, *Davenant*, i, 324. And see above, pp. 88, 89.

[1] B. Whitelocke, *Memorials of English Affairs*, 1682, p. 22; quoted by Dyce, *Shirley*, i, p. xxviii.

*Britannicum*, with eight changes of scene and as many antimasques. A feature of Carew's masque is the carping, cynical Momus, who speaks always in prose with a wit both searching and *risqué*. One of the antimasques represented a battle, marking a complete degeneracy from Jonson's conception of contrast, while "a prospect of Windsor Castle" was amongst the novelties of scene.[1] Carew's masque is often poetic in the lyrical parts; as compared with Shirley's it is lacking in dramatic instinct. As to form, Shirley's masque is chaos in activity; Carew's, chaos inert.

Milton's *Comus*, 1634.

To this year 1634 (September 29) belongs, too, the performance of Milton's *Comus*, an entertainment, masque-like in form, presented at Ludlow Castle before the Earl of Bridgewater, Lord President of Wales. This was not Milton's first venture in this kind. He had already furnished part of an entertainment presented to the Countess Dowager of Derby at Harefield a year or two before and now known as *Arcades*.[2] It appears to have been Lawes' friendship that procured for Milton both of these opportunities to display his lyrical talent, as Lawes wrote music for both and personally superintended the performance of *Comus*. Milton's part in *Arcades* includes three lovely lyrics and a speech of the Genius of the Wood. *Comus* is a far more elaborate production, and, even if not in strict parlance a masque (from the circum-

[1] Ebsworth, *Carew*, 134 and 164.

[2] The countess dowager, a patron of poets from Spenser to Milton, was the wife, by her second marriage, of Lord Chancellor Ellesmere. Sir John Egerton, his son by a former marriage, married Lady Frances Stanley, the countess dowager's daughter by her first marriage, and became Earl of Bridgewater. Thus *Arcades* and *Comus* were celebrations within the same family.

stance that it is neither the setting for a ball nor contains masquers), marks in more than one respect a return to the simpler and purer conception of such entertainments in earlier time. *Comus* presents a coherent situation expressed in an obvious and well sustained allegory. *Comus* is not dramatic, as those who have seen it in revival must confess; but the beauty and pure elevation of its thought, its lyrical music combined with "a certain Doric delicacy," give force to the words of its earliest eulogist when he declares, "I must plainly confess to have seen yet nothing parallel in our language: *Ipsa mollities*." [1] Although staged with no such pomp as that which distinguished the masques at court in this year, *Comus* exhibits three changes of scene, a wild wood, a stately palace, and the exterior of Ludlow Castle, in the great hall of which the masque was given. The participants were by no means all new to such devices, for not only was Lawes the guiding spirit, but Viscount Brackley and Thomas Egerton, sons of the Earl of Bridgewater (who with their sister the Lady Alice acted the chief parts of *Comus*), had already appeared as actors in *Cœlum Britannicum*. Similar productions to Milton's in kind if not in degree of excellence are *The Spring's Glory*, a dainty and poetical trifle intended for the prince's birthday, May 29, 1638, by Thomas Nabbes, and *A Masque at Bretbie*, on Twelfth Night, 1639, by Sir Aston Cockayne, presented to his kinsman, the Earl of Chesterfield. *Spring's Glory* is no more or less a masque than *Comus*. Cockayne's is in no wise notable, and probably represents the average of many a private masque which wise if envious Time has suffered to perish or lie buried in those ungarnered fields,

Other like private "masques."

[1] *Letter of Sir Henry Wotton to Milton*, April 13, 1638.

the muniment rooms of many an English ancient family.[1]

It was in 1635 that William Davenant offered the court his first masque, *The Temple of Love*. Davenant had already made a reputation as a dramatist of promise, and was destined to carry the traditions of the earlier theatrical age into the post-Restoration period. *The Temple of Love* is Davenant's best masque, and seems an honest attempt to restore this much-abused and deformed variety of composition to coherence and reasonable limits. The theme touches on the affectation of the hour, Platonic love;[2] and tells how Divine Poesie has obscured from the unworthy the temple of chaste Love to reëstablish it in all pristine glory through the influence of Indamora's (the queen's) beauty. The scenery, though reduced in variety and number of changes, was novel from its Eastern and Indian setting and costuming. The other masques of Davenant are not comparable to this. *Prince D'Amour* (February 24, 1636) was presented by the gentlemen of the Middle Temple in honor of Charles and Rupert, Princes Palatine, the nephews of the king. It is swift and direct in movement; and whilst the scenery was very sumptuous, the antimasques were reduced to two. *Britannia Triumphans* (January 7, 1638), presenting the glory of Britanocles, not without its slurs against his enemies, the Puritans, contains the original feature of "a mock romanza," with giant, dwarf,

The masques of Davenant, 1635–40;

his *Prince D'Amour* and other masques.

[1] Two minor masques are *The King and Queen's Entertainment at Richmond*, and *Corona Minervæ*, both in 1635, the last not mentioned in Brotanek's list. See the reprint of the former by Bang and Brotanek, *Materialien zur Kunde*, ii, 1903.

[2] Cf. Davenant's play *The Platonic Lovers*, and the treatment of the whole subject below, pp. 347, 348.

knight, and damsel, occupying the place of one of the antimasques, while the others were furnished by the ever popular humors of the street-folk of London. Lastly, *Salmacida Spolia* (January 21, 1640) a double masque, in which both Charles and Henrietta Maria took part, discloses the malicious fury of Discord, none too prophetically calmed by the wisdom of Philogenes, impersonated by the king. The antimasque contained twenty "entries," as they were now styled, some of them danced by three or two, or even by a single character. Brotanek has assigned to Davenant another masque entitled *Luminalia*, presented by the queen and her ladies, February 6, 1638.[1] This is a production of no little fancy; nor does it fall below the graceful mediocrity of Davenant.[2] Be *Luminalia* whose it may, Davenant's work in the masque is direct, not particularly original, and decidedly unlyrical; though, with the ever-fertile and ingenious devices of Jones, evidently sufficient to please the none too exacting demands of a time in which serious-minded men, whether Cavalier or Puritan, were busied with affairs other than "toys."

Masque-like plays.

This enumeration of English masques might be materially lengthened by stretching our period to include a few true masques that fall without it;[3] by the identification of some few manuscripts recorded as masques in the lists and dictionaries of the drama;[4]

[1] "Ein unerkanntes Werk Sir William Davenant's," *Anglia*, Beiblatt, xi, 177.

[2] See *Fuller's Worthies' Library*, iv, 117, 615, and 630, for some novel devices.

[3] Shirley's *Cupid and Death*, 1653; Jordan's *Fancy's Festival*, and Howell's *Nuptials of Peleus and Thetis*, both 1654, the last acted in Paris.

[4] See Fleay's *List*, *Chronicle*, ii, 343; and the many cases in

and by a looser employment of the term to include the dialogues and belated moralities which show direct influence of the masque in their inception or staging. The sum total of all these productions is by no means small; and they range from dramas such as *A Midsummer Night's Dream*,[1] or Dekker's *Old Fortunatus*, into which the masque-like quality has entered only in part, to complete mythological or allegorical plays such as Lyly's *Woman in the Moon*, Nash's *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, Dekker and Ford's exquisite *Sun's Darling* (1623), and Heywood's beautiful *Love's Mistress* (1634). More composite in its make-up is Rowley and Middleton's *The World Well Tost at Tennis* (1620), whilst pure allegory rules in Shirley's *Honor and Riches* (about 1631), and in the curious *Microcosmus* (1634) of Thomas Nabbes.[2] Some of these productions, such as Heywood's *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas*, "selected out of Lucan, Erasmus, Textor, and Ovid," and published in 1637, could not possibly have been intended for acting.[3] Others were performed privately, and even in public, on occasions which demanded neither the restrictions of "the entertainment" nor the elaboration of the masque. Aside from *Love's Mistress* and *The Sun's Darling*, just mentioned, none of these quasi-dramatic productions are more beautiful or poetic than those of James Shirley, his *Triumph of Beauty* (1639), "a

which Halliwell-Phillipps, *Dictionary*, appears to name masques by their personages.

[1] On the relation of this play to the masque, see Soergel, 80–82.

[2] On the relations of plays of this type to the masque, see *ibid.* 78–80.

[3] Cf. the scene in *Deorum Judicium* (*Works of Heywood*, vi, 250), in which Minerva is bidden doff her helmet and Venus her cestus, that Paris might judge unbiased by their magic powers

spirited and elegant presentation of the old theme, the judgment of Paris," and his *Contention of Ajax and Ulysses* (1640), immortal for the magnificent lyric, "The glories of our blood and state," with which it concludes. Finally, it seems altogether probable that a larger proportion of masques has perished than of some classes of the more regular drama. For masques were for the most part devised for private entertainment and by poets who lived less in the public eye, ephemeral productions of occasional literature which the world could well spare.

# XVI

## THE PASTORAL DRAMA

THE pastoral is a mode of literary expression, not a literary species; a way of regarding life and nature, not a variety of prose or of poetry. Originating in the Italy of the later Renaissance, the pastoral held its own in various forms in verse and prose, in Latin and Italian, from Sannazaro, whose famous prose romance, the *Arcadia*, was completed in 1489, to Tasso and Guarini, whose pastoral dramas were written in the lifetime of Shakespeare.[1] At home the pastoral gave life to the most vital branch of Italian drama; abroad, it influenced every literature of Europe. As an element the pastoral enters widely into the literature of Elizabeth and James, and produces as diverse products as *The Shepherds' Calendar*, *As You Like It*, and *Lycidas*. The pastoral came first into England in eclogue form, in Googe's translation of Mantuan's Latin imitations of Vergil.[2] The eclogue reached its height in *The Shepherds' Calendar*, and was revived in the reign of King James in the "pastorals" of Wither and Browne. The pastoral lyric

The pastoral a mode; its origin;

and introduction into England.

[1] Boccaccio foreshadowed the pastoral romance in his *Ameto*, a story in prose and verse first printed in 1478. See Greg, *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*, 1906, pp. 39–46. This chapter was in the printer's hands before I received a copy of this excellent work.

[2] Cf. the *Eclogs* of Barnaby Googe, 1561; and Turbervile's translation of the Eclogues of Mantuan, 1567. See, also, H. O. Sommer, *Erster Versüch über die englische Hirtendichtung*, Marburg, 1888.

came into vogue somewhat later, and was the chief lyrical fashion of the penultimate decade of the century. To such an extent did this passing mode rule, that older poetry republished was given a pastoral turn, and every lover became a swain, each lass a nymph or shepherdess.[1] The pastoralized lyric reached its height in the piratical collection known as *The Passionate Pilgrim*, 1599, in which appear five lyrics of Shakespeare. Of much the same period in its prevalence was the pastoral prose tale; though here, from Sidney's *Arcadia*, written in the early eighties, through Lodge's *Rosalynd* and Greene's *Pandosto* (to mention only these, the best known), there is scarcely a story which is purely pastoral and unmingled with other elements. The pastoral drama is of later growth, though its elements are coeval with the other pastoral species. Despite the nymphs and satyrs, the piping shepherds and coy shepherdesses of many an entertainment and scene of comedy at court and on the popular stage, it was not until the reign of James, until the conventionalized work of Daniel and Fletcher, that English drama was to know true pastoral comedy.

The pastoral idea;

The pastoral idea is linked with that chimera of the imagination, the golden age, and wanders in imaginary realms untenanted by creatures of flesh and blood. According to this idea, the country life is glorified, as exemplified in Arcadian shepherds, who live in eternal simplicity, leisure, and elegant discourse. In Arcadia all is blossom and fragrance; existence flows without a let save for the cares of love, without a pain save the twinges of jealousy. Oracles utter orotund enigmas, shepherds "pipe as

[1] See the present author's *Book of Elizabethan Lyrics*, pp. xiv, xv.

though they could never grow old," maids are sought or sweetly seeking, and, except for an occasional wild man or peasant for contrast's sake, all the pastoral's personages are equally cultivated, eloquent, poetical, and noble. With all its outdoor apparatus and its harping on primitive simplicity of conduct and manners, it is the artificiality of the pastoral that first strikes the observer. And yet its antithesis to nature is not the pastoral's most salient note; for the world may be lost in the flights of the idealist or diminished to nothing by subjective introspection. The pastoral can claim none of the freedom of the idealist; it is never self-questioning. Pastoral art has constantly its eye on the conduct of its fellows; it is, above all, conventional; pastoral art is much concerned with the usages and precedents of its foreign models; it is parasitic and unoriginal. Bolted through the successive filters of Latin, Italian, Spanish, and French literature, the pastoral is like some fine white meal, fit, when sweetened with sentiment, to use in the pastry of life, but little nutritious unaided by coarser and wholesomer food.

its artificiality.

The pastoral idea had its origin in a misconception of the ancients. Theocritus and his predecessors, cultivated man of the world that each was, "had only to pass the gates [of Syracuse], and wander through the fens of Lysimeleia, by the brackish mere, or ride into the hills, to find himself in the golden world of pastoral." [1] Theocritus is as truly a poet of nature in his way as Wordsworth and the rest who "returned" whence true poetry and art have never

Origin of the pastoral idea;

[1] Lang, *Theocritus and his Age*, *Translation of Theocritus*, 1889, p. xvii.

departed. On the other hand, the downs of Middlesex and the leafy lanes of Kent harbored neither Strephon nor Amaryllis, but sunburnt maids and men of the soil, whom the English poet's fancy might transmute into William, Phœbe, and Audrey, and yet remain true to the real English world that surrounded them.[1]

English love of country.

The English pastoral was thus from the first exposed to the disintegrating influences of that English love of the country and fidelity to its facts which has distinguished English literature in almost all ages. But it carried with it none the less the long line of artificialities, improbabilities, and conventionalized ideals which such writers as Tasso, Guarini, and Montemayor had grafted upon the initial misconception of Theocritus and Vergil. Moreover, the pastoral had gathered with its later writers and from medieval sources a tendency towards allegory and satire. The portrayal of an ideal state, whether ethical or æsthetic, is seldom without a lively sense of the disparity thus created between things as they are and things as we would have them. This antithesis, in pastoral literature, took the shape of a picture of moral life from which the rude, the coarse, the common, and the sordid were carefully expunged. Once and for all banished the country, all the vices and follies of human life, its cares and its complexities, congregated in the town. If the pastoral idealized the country, it came soon to satirize the city, and the foil is scarcely less conventional than the picture, the perfections of which it was created to offset. As to allegory, the whole age was afflicted with it, and less than some other modes could so formal a production as the pastoral hope to escape.

[1] Cf. *As You Like It*, v, i and ii.

The pastoral drama in Italy;

In Italy the pastoral drama had grown out of romances such as the *Arcadia* of Sannazaro and the eclogues of Mantuan.[1] As early as 1506, Castiglione had written a pastoral masque for the entertainment of the court of Urbino. And towards the middle of the century a genuine pastoral drama, albeit of little merit as literature, had arisen in the hands of Beccari.[2] The creation of Italian literary pastoral drama is universally referred to Tasso, whose *Aminta* was acted at Ferrara in 1573. Here in a story of almost naïve simplicity, but rich in the embellishments of poetry, appear in their fullness the familiar figures afterwards to become so staled by incessant repetition: the lover infatuated almost to madness, the maiden coy almost to prudery, the subtle and shameless matchmaker, the satyr coarse and violent, and the confidants, shepherd and shepherdess, whose presence alone makes many a passage of poetical declamation possible. Although Tasso's *Aminta* inspired many imitations, its superiority over them all has never been seriously impugned. For when Guarini attempted to rival his master with *Il Pastor Fido*, nearly twenty years later, he was compelled to resort to a far more complicated structure and to call to

Tasso's *Aminta*.

*Il Pastor Fido*.

[1] Sannazaro's *Arcadia* was completed by 1489, though not authoritatively published until 1504. My friend, Professor Rennert, calls my attention to the excellent work of Scherillo, "*La Arcadia di Jacobo Sannazaro* seccondo i Manoscritti e le prime Stampe, con note ed Introduzione," Torino, 1888, "in which the *Arcadia* and its sources are discussed with a thoroughness that leaves little to be said."

[2] For a succinct résumé of the Italian pastoral drama, see Garnett, *A History of Italian Literature*, 1898, pp. 233–236; and the admirable account by Greg, *Pastoral*, 155–214. Politiziano's *Orfeo*, 1471, is not a pastoral, though frequently alluded to as such.

his aid the machinery of the wrath of the incensed goddess, Cynthia, and the enigmatic oracles a fulfillment of which alone could appease the divine wrath. *Il Pastor Fido* is a very skillfully constructed play, and while it added no new character to its species, developed its dramatic capabilities to a point not exceeded in any subsequent production. Though less poetic than *Aminta*, *Il Pastor Fido* fully merits its great repute as Tasso's only rival in Italian pastoral drama. English drama appears to have been little affected by the scores of imitations which these two celebrated Italian pastorals inspired in Italy and elsewhere. But the *Aminta* was translated first into Latin by Thomas Watson in 1585, and in part into English by Abraham Fraunce two years later, a complete English translation, that of Henry Reynolds, appearing in 1628. *Il Pastor Fido* was anonymously translated in 1602, acted perhaps in Italian, at Cambridge, in 1606, translated into Latin at the same university at an uncertain date,[1] and definitively translated by Richard Fanshaw in 1647. Apparently the only other pastoral drama translated in England was Luigi Groto's *Pentimento Amoroso*, acted under the title *Parthenia* at Cambridge, at an uncertain date, and turned into Latin by an unknown author.[2]

Translation of Italian pastorals in England.

Traces of pastoral influence appear in English drama in the seventies, in a masque of wild men at court in 1573, and in Gascoigne's use of such a personage as Sylvanus or the "*hombre salvagio*" in the

Earlier pastoral influences; Gascoigne's *Entertainments*.

[1] On the translations of Tasso into English, see Koeppel in *Anglia*, xi, 11. On the Latin version, *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 318, where a suggestion of one or other of the Fletchers as the author of this translation is made.

[2] *Ibid.* 321, where this play is described.

queen's entertainments at Kenilworth two years later.[1] The device by which a voice called "Deep Desire" spoke to the queen out of a bush at one of these meetings of her majesty with the ingenious poet has already been referred for original to *Il Pastor Fido*.[2] The device of Echo is equally Italian, though not to be found in Guarini's play. The same critic concludes that Gascoigne was the first borrower of pastoral material for such purposes as these from similar Italian productions. In the autumn of 1578 we meet, for the first time, with "shepherds in a pastoral setting" in the lively little pastoral interlude of Sidney, *The Lady of May*. To this production attention has already been called.[3] Suffice it to repeat that here is dialogue in prose and contest in song, and comic relief in the rôle of Rombus, the pedant, a familiar figure of Italian comedy. In the following January the Earl of Leicester's company acted *A Greek Maid*, described as "a pastorell or historie," at court: a record interesting as an early use of this designation and from the circumstance that, unless the word was a misnomer, we have here the earliest recorded performance of a play of this type by a regular company of professional actors.[4]

Sidney's *Lady of May*.

The pastoral element continued to tinge the enter-

[1] See the present author's *Works of Gascoigne*, 65.

[2] *Il Pastor Fido*, I, iv; Thorndike, "Pastoral Element in the English Drama before 1605," *Modern Language Notes*, xiv, 231.

[3] Above, p. 98.

[4] *Revels' Accounts*, 125. It is of interest to note that the early traces of the pastoral in England thus offer a parallel to "the theory of Rossi (*Battista Guarini ed Il Pastor Fido*, 1886, Part II, chapter i), that the Italian pastoral drama was developed from the eclogue through the medium of public pageants in honor of noble families." Thorndike, *Pastoral Element*, 229; and Bond, *Lyly*, ii, 474.

Pastoral entertainments in the later years of the reign.

tainments of the royal progresses. At Cawdry, in 1591, a wild man addressed the queen from beside a tree. At Bisham, in the next year, Pan, attended by "two virgins keeping sheep and sewing in their samplers," spoke to her majesty from a little hill. A more elaborate entertainment, at Studeley just after, represented Daphne, issuing from the riven tree and pursued by Apollo, seeking refuge with Elizabeth, protectress of chastity; and a comic diversion followed, likewise pastoral, in which "the Cutter of Cootsholde" and his like hold jocular discourse.[1] And so on through the dialogue between two shepherds in praise of Astræa recited at the house of its author, the Countess of Pembroke, in 1601, to the excellent *Complaint of the Satyrs against the Nymphs* with which Ben Jonson welcomed Queen Anne on progress from Scotland to her husband's coronation in 1603.[2] Thorndike excludes "the Cutter of Cootsholde" from the pastoral category, feeling that he is an English countryman and shows none of the marks of having been borrowed from Italy.[3] Bond, who assigns all these and other entertainments of the period to Lyly, (whether wisely or unwisely does not concern us here), very pertinently reminds us that "the classical impulse, once imparted, would work on somewhat the same lines in different countries," and suggests the thought that we have in these entertainments rather a parallel to the similar development of the pastoral in Italy from the eclogue through the pageantry of noble entertainment than the direct importation into England of an exotic variety of art.[4] From a literary

[1] See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 135, 137, 142, 529.
[2] Nichols, *James*, i, 176.
[3] *Pastoral Element*, 235.
[4] Bond, *Lyly*, ii, 474.

point of view, the finest bit of poetry among these entertainments is the dainty little pastoral of *Coridon and Phyllida*, part of Queen Elizabeth's entertainment at Elvetham in Hampshire in 1591, and even were it not definitely ascribed to him in his time, Nicholas Breton all over.[1]

Pastoral scenes in *The Arraignment of Paris*, 1581,

If Fleay's assignment of Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* to a performance at court in February, 1581, is to be accepted, this charming production must be pronounced the earliest extant drama to utilize the pastoral atmosphere.[2] Here the scene is laid "in Ida Vales," and gods and goddesses commune familiarly with Colin and Hobbinol, Diggon and Thenot, who are Arcadians all. Œnone's conjurations to Paris to be true, the three shepherds' arguments on the nature of love, Colin's death and the punishment of Thestylis, his scornful mistress, all are of the essence of the pastoral drama, as are the exquisite songs which Peele has lavished on this his "first increase."[3] It is to be noted, too, that on its publication in 1584 this play was entitled "a Pastorall," and that the words, "Amyntas' lusty boy," most likely contain an allusion to Watson's *Amyntas* if not to Tasso himself.[4] In an able, if somewhat conservative, monograph on this subject, *Pastoral Influence in the English Drama*,

[1] It shakes the confidence which one would gladly give to so elaborate a piece of work as Mr. Bond's *Lyly* to find that editor willing to admit even the possibility of Lyly's authorship of work so unquestionably another's as this or Peele's "sonet," "His golden locks Time hath to silver turned." See i, 411, 447, 517, 524.

[2] Fleay, ii, 152.

[3] *Arraignment*, I, ii; II, i and ii, etc.

[4] *Ibid.* III, i. Peele's fragment, *The Hunting of Cupid*, has already been mentioned. There is little to indicate that it was a pastoral.

this play, like several others "affected but not dominated by the pastoral influence, is excluded from the list of pastoral dramas." [1] Smith continues: "A free combination of elements was the practice of the more skillful playwrights and undoubtedly led to the production of more interesting plays — for pastoral scenes and characters are restricted within too narrow a range for the best comedy, and when employed in tragedy they fail to stir the deeper emotions. On the other hand, this introduction of elements foreign to the pastoral spirit oftentimes disturbs the general effect and brings in irritating incongruities. The dramatists, however, who used this method followed the example of the writers of pastoral romance, who frequently mingle pastoral with non-pastoral elements. In the English drama the chief elements combined with the pastoral were (1) the 'mythological' element, concerned with the gods and goddesses of the Greek theology; (2) the 'forest' element, bringing in outlaws and hunters; and (3) the 'court' element, introducing kings and courtiers. Each of these elements brings with it a characteristic atmosphere, which in each case is distinct from the pastoral atmosphere." [2] Similarly, Greg denominates these earliest English pastoral plays as those of "the mythological school;" but seems to go too far when he says "Peele's work is purely the offspring of an academic brain writing for the court; . . . the introduction of a pastoral element is accidental, suggested by the fact that the hero was at the time leading a

"The mythological pastoral school."

[1] University of Pennsylvania thesis, 1897, by Dr. Homer Smith, now professor in Ursinus College.

[2] Smith, "Pastoral Influence," *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, xii, 1897, p. 372.

shepherd's life . . . Nothing could well be more unlike the Italian pastoral." [1]

Pastoral elements in the court dramas of Lyly.

Lyly, in several of his plays, exhibits the same combination of elements observable in this comedy of Peele. The scene of *Love's Metamorphosis* is laid in Arcadia and the play on its title described as "a wittie and courtly pastorall." [2] Three nymphs of Ceres, described as "cruell," "coy," and "wavering," are wooed by three countrymen, not distinguished as shepherds. The nymphs remain unresponsive, and Cupid, in anger at their coldness, metamorphoses them into a stone, a rose, and a bird. There is the pastoral praise of chastity, the pastoral interminable chatter about love, the writing of verses on trees, the chase of a nymph by a satyr, and attempt at a rural atmosphere.[3] In the probably earlier *Gallathea*, too, a plot, derived from Ovid, is transferred to Lincolnshire which the gods visit — as why should they not? — with an ease equal to that exercised in Arcadia.[4] Aside from the fact that "the sacrifice of a virgin to Neptune forms the basis of the plot, as in *Il Pastor Fido*," the aged shepherds, Tyterus and Melebeus, preserve some smack of the pastoral in their talk as in their names, and neither are the loves of "Diana's nymphs," each for a shepherd, nor the passion of the two maidens, Gallathea and Phillida, for each other, each mistaking the

[1] "The Pastoral Drama on the Elizabethan Stage," *Cornhill Magazine*, 1899, n. s. vii, 204. See, however, his more liberal estimate, *Pastoral*, 216–224.

[2] Probably first acted before 1591; printed in 1600. Bond, *Lyly*, iii, 295.

[3] Cf. especially I, i and ii; III, i; and IV, i.

[4] Bond dates *Gallathea* late in 1584. *Lyly*, ii, 425.

other for a boy, wholly foreign to Arcadian manners.[1] In *Midas* the pastoral touch is very slight and centers in a group of shepherds who appear with Pan and Apollo and in conjunction with a corresponding bevy of nymphs.[2] Lastly, several points of contact have been suggested between *The Woman in the Moon* and *Il Pastor Fido*, — the shepherds' dispute as to the killing of the boar, the use of the cave, and the "satyr motive."[3] There seems little reason to doubt that in *Gallathea* and in *Love's Metaphormosis* Lyly was affecting the pastoral mode in his own liberal way, far removed though these comedies remain from the stricter rules which governed the Italian pastoral. Indeed, despite an elaborate attempt to refer these two plays, besides others of Lyly, to immediate Italian models and suggestions,[4] we may agree with Bond, who has examined the subject with as much zeal as sanity, when he says: "Lyly adopts the set pastoral air, the long speeches, and soliloquies, the artificiality . . . of representing folk of evident culture and refinement as living a life of woodland simplicity: and since the elaborate pastoral works of Sidney and of Lodge only made their appearance in 1590, his example for these things must be sought partly in the classics and partly in Italy. But to search [especially the pastoralists] for close or abundant detailed debt in Lyly's plays is probably vain."[5] Bond concludes with a statement

[1] Thorndike, *Pastoral Element*, 238. But Lyly's source was certainly Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, iv, 670.

[2] Bond dates *Midas* 1589. *Lyly*, iii, 111.

[3] Thorndike, *Pastoral Element*, 240.

[4] *Die stofflichen Beziehungen der englischen Komödie zur italienischen bis Lilly*, by L. L. Schücking, Halle, 1901.

[5] Bond, *Lyly*, ii, 483. The whole note, 473–485, should be read.

of the points of difference between Lyly and Sannazaro or Tasso, in which he suggests the English poet's substitution of forestry for the shepherd and his flock, "a gayer and more sporting note of ideal comedy," and less of the "pessimist harping back to a golden age," while he confesses some loss of poetry.[1]

*The Maid's Metamorphosis*, printed in 1600, is wholly of this mythological-pastoral school, and a comedy of considerable merit. It is plainly not Lyly's, and is more wisely assigned to the authorship of John Day for its "abruptness and direct [dramatic] force," for a certain romantic quaintness, and for the easy carelessness of its verse, than to Daniel who is everywhere restrained, intellectual, and, in practicing the pastoral, orthodox as to the practices of his kind.[2] *The Maid's Metamorphosis* tells the story of Eurymene, who, passionately pursued by Apollo, challenges him to prove his godhood by transforming her into a man, which miracle the angry god performs. Though exiled, and her life sought because beloved of Prince Ascanio, the constancy of the lovers leads Apollo to declare that Eurymene is really a long-lost princess and to restore her to her original sex. This comedy is full of poetry, and the songs vie with Lyly's own little epigrammatical lyrics. In two later comedies of Day, though neither can be called pastorals by the most indulgent, "a sort of Arcadian

*The Maid's Metamorphosis*, 1600.

Pastoral elements in Day's comedies.

[1] *Ibid.* 484. Mr. Bond's date for *Gallathea*, 1584, makes the influence of *Il Pastor Fido* on it impossible.

[2] Lyly's authorship of this play is now generally rejected. Fleay suggested Daniel, *Chronicle*, ii, 324. Bond agrees with the suggestion of Gosse, acquiesced in by Bullen, that this comedy is early work of Day. For a full discussion of the topic, see Bond, *Lyly*, iii, 334–339; and Bullen, *Old English Plays*, i, 99.

fancy" still lingers. *The Isle of Gulls* takes an episode from Sidney's *Arcadia* and works it into a light, gay, and irresponsible little satirical comedy full of the open air. *Humor Out of Breath* touches the pastoral in its charming opening scenes in which two young princes, sent on a quest to find ladies worthy of them, fall in love with the daughters of their father's banished enemy, whom they first behold engaged in the Arcadian occupation of fishing in a brook.[1]

Pastoral elements in other Elizabethan comedies.

The mention of these comedies of Day has carried us beyond the date at which the true pastoral drama was introduced into England.[2] And although we must deny any real pastoral element to *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, much more that this comedy owes anything to the *Diana* of Montemayor, some few traces remain to suggest that others besides Peele and Lyly preceded Daniel in experiments of this kind.[3] There was a *Phyllida and Corin*, mentioned in the *Revels' Accounts* as acted at court by the Queen's men in 1584[4] A pastoral character is claimed for the extant comedy *Silvanus* by one Rollinson, acted at Cambridge in 1596, though its imitation of *The Shepherds' Calendar* shows that part of its inspiration at least was nearer home than Ferrara.[5] Heywood's *Amphrisa or the Forsaken Shepherdess*, if, as has been supposed, its earlier draft goes back to the year 1597, is a translation pure and simple, and perhaps,

[1] *The Isle of Gulls* was printed in 1606; *Humor Out of Breath*, two years later.

[2] See below, p. 156.

[3] See Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 378; and Furness, *Variorum Midsummer Night's Dream*, 283.

[4] *Revels' Accounts*, 188.

[5] *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 294.

after all, may never have been staged;[1] *The Thracian Wonder* is far more heroic than pastoral;[2] while the claim of *Mucedorus*, despite a bear, a wild man, and many scenes in the wildwood, begins and ends with the shepherd's disguise of the romantic prince of that name.[3] Lastly, Henslowe's diary disclosed two titles unmistakably suggestive of their class. These are *The Arcadian Virgin* by Chettle and Haughton, and a *Pastoral Tragedy*, the work — strange to say — of Chapman, both entered under the year 1599.[4]

The English ideal of free rural life embodied in *Robin Hood.*

But the pastoral, which mingled mythological figures with those of Arcadia, was not the only attempt at the comedy of outdoor life which was known to this period. England, no less than Italy, possessed a traditional ideal of free and rural life which had grown up, in the ballad in particular, from immemorial time. Here the ideal sought was freedom, and immunity from the hardships of tyrannical law. The careless, happy life of foresters and freebooters was placed in contrast with the misuse of bourgeois and feudal power, precisely as the simple shepherd's life was contrasted in the pastoral with the complexity and intrigue of city and court.[5] This "forest" element, as it has been happily designated, never became wholly conventionalized in English drama, though it naturally attracted to itself the pastoral ideal and became in part confused with it. Leaving aside the dramatized ballads on Robin Hood, which have received attention in another connection

Plays on Robin Hood.

[1] Fleay identifies this with one of *Five Plays in One*; see his *Chronicle*, i, 286.

[2] Above, i, p. 204.

[3] *Mucedorus* was already in print by 1598; see above, i, p. 240.

[4] Henslowe, 110, 116.

[5] Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 378.

where they belong,[1] the register in 1594 of *A Pastoral Pleasant Comedy of Robin Hood and Little John* exemplifies in this title the confusion of ideas just mentioned above;[2] and another lost play, *Robin hoodes penerthes* [*i. e.* pennyworths] of Henslowe, 1600, offers little food for surmise. In *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntington*, and his *Death*, its sequel, Munday and Chettle totally failed to reproduce the atmosphere of Sherwood Forest that breathes through the ballads, and frittered away their opportunity in "history" and intrigue.[3] Both plays are absolutely unpastoral and as free from any "taint" of Italy as the fresh country scenes of *Friar Bacon*.

Relation of *As You Like It* to the pastoral.

Two English plays alone successfully combine the pastoral element with the English forest ideal. These are Shakespeare's *As You Like It*, which compromises the claims of Arcadia and Sherwood Forest with that most poetic of all ideal lands, the Forest of Arden, and *The Sad Shepherd*, wherein Jonson, as frankly as Lyly before him, conveyed Arcadia to Nottinghamshire and Merry England.[4] Smith has interestingly shown how in derivation the story which Shakespeare immortalized was first told as a plain tale of English outlawry and vengeance, then transformed into a pastoral on Italian model, and finally harmonized by Shakespeare's magic art.[5] The original story — suggestion is the better word — is the medieval *Tale of*

[1] Above, i, pp. 283, 284.

[2] Arber, *Stationers' Register*, ii, 649.

[3] These plays were acted in 1598, and printed three years later. See above, i, p. 280, and the present author's *The English Chronicle Play*, 160–162.

[4] Cf. *Gallathea*, the plot of which is laid in Lincolnshire.

[5] See Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 378–382, for a full discussion of this topic.

*Gamelyn*, ignorantly attributed to Chaucer. Herein we have a brief narrative, in verse, of a dying father and his three sons; of the injustice of the eldest brother, Johan, to Gamelyn, the youngest; of the latter's prowess as a wrestler, his refuge with a "maister outlawe," and the final killing of Johan and the lawful succession of the surviving brothers to their father's estate. No woman enters into *The Tale of Gamelyn*, and Smith is right in identifying the forest with Sherwood, the "maister outlawe" with Robin Hood, and Gamelyn with the "young Gammel," Robin's nephew of one of the ballads.[1] On this slender basis Thomas Lodge erected his pastoral prose romance of *Rosalynd*, naming Gamelyn, Rosader, and inventing fair Rosalynd to match him, conveying a group of shepherds and shepherdesses, real or disguised, into an Arcadian Forest of Ardenne and transforming the "maister outlawe" into Gerismond, the outlawed King of France. *Rosalynd* is more truly pastoral than any play of Lyly's, and completely orthodox in tone and coloring. Shakespeare in *As You Like It* restored the English tone, though Arcadia still bordered on Arden. The banished Duke and his retinue lead the life of Robin Hood, not that of the *Aminta;* save that Celia buys a sheepfold to elude pursuit, she is no shepherdess, nor wishes to become one. Silvius and Phœbe are pastoral; but Corin, to say nothing of Shakespeare's own figures, Audrey and William, are genuine English rural folk. Nor is the exquisite wooing of Orlando and Rosalind, but for its savor of burlesque, in any wise pastoral. In a word, *As You Like It* is no true pastoral drama, and its only actual

[1] *Ibid.* 379; and cf. the ballad of *Robin Hood and the Stranger*, Child, *English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, iii, 144 ff.

relation to the genuine products of this conventional type lies in its diverting parody of the sentimentality of Arcadian love-throes and wooing.[1]

True pastoral drama in England.

Deferring *The Sad Shepherd* by reason of its doubtful date, let us turn to a consideration of the true pastoral drama in England. The earliest English pastoral play of unmixed type is *The Queen's Arcadia*, acted before her majesty at Christ Church College, Oxford, in August, 1605, and the work of Samuel Daniel. We have met with Daniel in these pages already several times. It was Daniel, it will be remembered, who excited the enmity of Jonson and was lampooned by him in satirical plays; it was Daniel who practiced with rigidity and literary success the Senecan drama as conceived by Garnier in France, and encountered the rivalry of Jonson at court, alike in the entertainment and in the masque.[2] Moreover, despite some earlier attempts, Daniel was the poet who took the pastoral to Oxford, though few plays apparently resulted there from his example.[3] Daniel had visited Italy and had met Guarini. A sonnet prefixed to the translation of *Il Pastor Fido* of 1602 attests the English poet's continued interest in the subject.

Daniel's *Queen's Arcadia*, 1605;

*The Queen's Arcadia* preserves the pastoral atmosphere throughout; but though original in plot, follows the norm of *Aminta* rather than that of *Il Pastor Fido*.[4] Amyntas loves Cloris, but she is fancy free. Colax, a corrupt, returned traveler, procures Techne,

[1] The only play of possibly early date that combines the pastoral note with Professor Smith's third element, that of the court, is *The Thracian Wonder*, treated above, i, p. 204.

[2] Above, i, pp. 478, 480; ii, pp. 8–10, 102, 110.

[3] Above, p. 80.

[4] See, especially, III, i, and V, iii, lines 1023–1035 and 2202–2211.

"a subtle wench of Corinth," to advance his suit for Cloris' love; and, failing in this, Techne invites Cloris to meet her in a certain cave. Thither Techne sends first Colax and then Amyntas, that the latter may oversee the meeting thus contrived for innocent Cloris and wicked Colax; for Techne has meanwhile conceived a passion for Amyntas and hopes by destroying that lover's faith in Cloris to win him for herself. This plot succeeds as to Amyntas, although Cloris escapes Colax. Techne tries in vain to comfort Amyntas, and as he rushes away to kill himself is smitten with remorse, and confesses all to Cloris, who, now moved to love, recovers her lover from his poisonous draught by the aid of an herb-woman, and the evil-doers are banished. This main thread of the plot is complicated by other matters: the separation of Sylvia and Palæmon, two "jealous lovers," by the further machination of Colax; the lamentations of Daphne, who has been betrayed by the same culprit; and the suit of Amarillis, the forward shepherdess, for the reluctant huntsman and lover of Cloris, Carinus. The wicked personages, too, are reinforced in Lincus, a pettifogger, who attempts the introduction of quarrels and law-suits into Arcadia, and Alcon, a quack-salver, who has but two cures for all ills, a sweet and delicate cordial and "one poor pill I use for greater cures." It is this latter personage who utters the famous descant on tobacco, a passage nicely calculated for the ears of the royal author of *A Counterblast to Tobacco*.[1] Naturally conceived as are most of these figures and carefully planned as is the plot, the effect is not a little impaired by an inartificial device by which "two ancient Arcadians" are made to over-

Its satirical underplot.

[1] *The Queen's Arcadia*, III, i, lines 1112–1164.

hear all the plots and lovemaking, to act as a species of chorus and *deus ex machina* combined, and thus bring about the banishment of the wicked at the end with a general reform of the state. As to execution, Daniel is everywhere a man of taste, and his breeding is that of the court. If never really great, Daniel is consistently graceful and eloquent, and on occasion rises to the dignity of genuine poetic utterance.

*The Faithful Shepherdess*, 1608.

Day's *Isle of Gulls* and *Humor Out of Breath*, already mentioned above, seem to have been the only popular plays containing pastoral elements which intervened between Daniel's play and Fletcher's.[1] *The Faithful Shepherdess* was acted in 1608 and first printed in the following year. According to the author, "the people . . . when it was played, having ever had a singular gift in defining, concluded [it] to be a play of country hired shepherds in grey cloaks, with curtailed dogs in strings, sometimes laughing together, and sometimes killing one another; and missing Whitsun-ales, cream, wassail, and morris-dances, began to be angry." [2] Although thus rejected by the popular stage of King James, *The Faithful Shepherdess* was revived in 1634, with a setting of Inigo Jones' devising, and was "much thronged after and often shown, but it is only for the scene's sake, which is very fine and worthy seeing," says Pepys.[3] Five quartos within the century attest the popularity of Fletcher's play with readers, among them Milton; for to *The Faithful Shepherdess* the greater poet is assuredly indebted for not a few of the specific beauties of *Comus*.[4]

[1] See above, i, p. 397.

[2] *The Faithful Shepherdess*, "To the Reader."

[3] *Diary*, ed. Bright, 1876, ii, 239.

[4] Masson, *Life and Times of Milton*, i, 622; and see Verity's

Fletcher's conception of the pastoral.

In justification of his poem Fletcher wrote that "a pastoral is a representation of shepherds and shepherdesses with their actions and passions, which must be such as may agree with their natures, at least not exceeding former fictions and vulgar traditions." The pastoral must "not be adorned with any art, but such . . . as nature is said to bestow, as singing and poetry; or such as experience may teach them, as the virtues of herbs and fountain, the ordinary course of the sun, moon, and stars and such like." And, above all, "you are ever to remember shepherds to be such as all the ancient poets, and modern, of understanding have received them; that is, the owners of flocks and not hirelings."[1] In a word, Fletcher accepted pastoral precedent and convention, even to the preservation of the unities of time and place.[2]

Story of *The Faithful Shepherdess.*

The Faithful Shepherdess is Clorin, who, her lover having died, has set up a bower near his grave wherein she lives the life of an anchoress and practices simple arts of healing. She is assisted in her work by a gentle Satyr on whose original nature devotion to this pure mistress has wrought a miracle. . . . Clorin is sought in love by Thenot, but she gently but firmly refuses him, and at last repulses him completely by a momentary pretense of yielding; for it was Clorin's constancy, not Clorin, that Thenot adored. Amoret, unkindly wounded by her lover, Porigot, who, practiced on, has thought her false, is brought by the Satyr to Clorin for cure; and so, too, is Alexis, justly

recognition of the identity of the motive of the two poems, his ed. of *Arcades and Comus*, Pitt Press, pp. xxxvii–xl.

[1] *The Faithful Shepherdess*, "To the Reader."

[2] The scene is a village and neighboring grove in Thessaly; the time from evening until the following morning.

wounded by a sullen shepherd on account of Cloe, a light-o'-love. All these and other shepherds and shepherdesses are cured or reclaimed in the end by the holy anchoress, who continues faithful to her dead love. While it cannot be said that these customary figures of pastoral drama attain to any unusual distinction in Fletcher's hands, and while it must be confessed that there are serious blemishes in the technique of the plot, the uniform beauty of Fletcher's diction, the melody of his riming decasyllabic couplets, varied, as they are, by passages of exquisite octosyllables, conspire with the high poetic quality of the whole drama to give to *The Faithful Shepherdess* a place of deserved prominence among the works of its author.

Supposed allegory of love in *The Faithful Shepherdess.*

It has been thought, perhaps not without reason, that in this story, which is certainly his own, Fletcher sought to conceal an allegory of the various phases of love.[1] Clorin's devotion to her dead lover symbolizes constancy; Amoret and Perigot's story, true love; in Thenot is figured chivalrous devotion to woman; in Alexis and Amaryllis, physical passion; while animal lust is unmistakably and grossly represented in Cloe and the Sullen Shepherd. In such a view of the play the outrageous figure of Cloe seems partly justified, while as a real person she is as revolting as the forgiveness of her wantonness is outrageous. In view of such an explanation, too, the improbability of Thenot's cure by Clorin's pretense of love loses some of its incredibility, and the drama at large gains somewhat in interest. On the other hand, it is not to be forgotten that an essential element of Fletcher's art was vivid contrast; indeed the contrast between

[1] On this topic, see Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 407, 408.

Arethusa and Megra in *Philaster* is only relatively less striking than that between Clorin and Cloe. Whatever the meaning of the allegory of *The Faithful Shepherdess*, we may agree that "few thoughtful men can accept the conclusions which Fletcher suggests, first, that constancy to a dead lover and a vow of virginity are supremely holy; secondly, that spiritual love between the sexes is necessarily destroyed by any taint of physical love, . . . and thirdly, that the deification of woman is in itself commendable. Finally, though all may assent to the doom pronounced on the lustful, yet few will accept Fletcher's portrayal of it as legitimate art."[1] Greg finds in this play an "antagonism between Fletcher's own sympathies and the ideal he set before him," and discerns in this "the key to the enigma of his play."[2]

*The Winter's Tale*, 1611.

After the failure of Fletcher's play to catch the taste of the London playgoers, no attempt was made to popularize the pastoral until Ben Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, of which more below, though about two tragicomedies of adventurous romantic type a pastoral atmosphere hovers to a certain degree. The first is Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale*, usually dated 1610 or 1611, the second Robert Daborne's neglected but meritorious *Poor Man's Comfort*, evidently written before 1613. *The Winter's Tale* was dramatized from the prose story of Robert Greene, *Pandosto, or Dorastus and Fawnia*, first published in 1588. In this story Fawnia, whom Shakespeare fittingly named Perdita, is reared by a shepherd, as in the play, and is wooed and won by Prince Dorastus at a

[1] *Ibid.* 408.

[2] Greg, *Pastoral*, 274. This author's complete and interesting treatment of *The Faithful Shepherdess* should be read entire.

shepherds' festival. But Shakespeare has expanded these suggestions of the shepherds' life into charming scenes of country mirth and the delightful love-making of Florizel and Perdita. The "dance of shepherds and shepherdesses" and of "rustics habited like satyrs" seem obvious devices and need not be referred to masques at court or anywhere else for original.[1] Nothing could be more completely antithetical than the conventionalities of the pastoral drama and these fresh scenes of country life. The remainder of the play presents the customary atmosphere of the court. *The Poor Man's Comfort* is a very pretty romantic comedy telling the story of a shepherd whose fair daughter, Urania, has been deserted by her husband, a nobleman of Thessaly, whom the shepherd had befriended in his exile; how the shepherd sought redress at court and was denied; but how, in the end, through Urania's devotion to her recreant husband, the shepherd's wrongs reached the ear of a just king and all was righted.[2] There is much else in the play: shipwreck, a mad prince restored to reason by the power of love, a princess saved from violence by an honest young shepherd, and a pastoral element as unconventional as is Shakespeare's own. The character of Gisbert, the poor man, is excellent and written evidently *con amore;* Daborne must have known such affronts as his hero suffered. And a novel departure from precedent lies in the circumstance that at the end neither Gisbert nor his daughter are discovered to be prince or princess in disguise. *The Poor Man's Com-*

*The Poor Man's Comfort*, 1613.

[1] *The Winter's Tale*, IV, iii, 164 and 354.

[2] This is a very rare play. It was printed in 1655. As to Daborne, see above, i, p. 292, and especially, ii, p. 241.

*fort* is written with the touch and grasp of old time, and is quite enough to raise Daborne, hack-writer though he was, to a respected place among the dramatists of his day.

Passing *Scyros, a Pastoral*, by Samuel Brooke, acted at Cambridge before Prince Charles in 1613, we reach Daniel's second venture in the pastoral drama, *Hymen's Triumph*.[1] The title discloses that the play was "presented at the Queen's court in the Strand, at her Majesty's magnificent entertainment of the King's most excellent Majesty, being at the nuptials of the Lord Roxborough, February, 1614." We have thus the use of a pastoral drama in a manner similar to that of a masque: and its shortness and more lyrical character, as compared with *The Queen's Arcadia*, show that Daniel marked the difference of the occasion. *Hymen's Triumph* is strictly a pastoral; its scene is Arcadia; its characters, shepherds and shepherdesses, with a forester or two for contrast. It admits neither satire nor allegory save for a short prologue between Hymen, Avarice, and Jealousy, matter quite apart from the play. And each act ends with a short lyrical chorus, several songs of great merit being interspersed through the action. *Hymen's Triumph* exhibits greater maturity than Daniel's earlier pastoral; a firmer, simpler plot and personages, if not quite so conventionally contrasted, at least as distinctly drawn. Its uniform elegance of diction upholds the justice of the epithet

*Hymen's Triumph*, 1614.

[1] *Scyros* is still extant in *Emmanuel College Library*, Cambridge. See Wood, *Fasti*, i, 401, as to Brooke, who was a brother to the better known Christopher Brooke, the poet. Another Latin pastoral of Brooke's, entitled *Melanthe*, was acted before the king two years later.

"well languaged" which a contemporary eulogist applied to Daniel; and its poetry, while tame beside the brighter colors of Fletcher, is everywhere estimable and sincere.

*Scicelides*, 1615.

In *Sicelides, a Piscatory*, by Phineas Fletcher, we have an exceedingly interesting play, and a novel though authentic variety of the pastoral. *Sicelides* was intended for performance before King James at King's College, Cambridge, in March, 1615, should he "have tarried another night." [1] It was later acted before King Charles.[2] Phineas Fletcher was the elder son of Giles Fletcher, author of *Licia*, a series of sonnets, and of a valuable tract, *On the Russe Commonwealth*. The brother of Phineas, a younger Giles, was a poet of repute and memorable for his stately narrative poem, *Christ's Victory*, as Phineas is chiefly remembered, and sometimes ignorantly maligned, for his really beautiful poem, *The Purple Island*.[3] These poets were first cousins of John Fletcher, the dramatist, and devotedly attached to the name, the memory, and the poetry of Spenser. Born in 1582, Phineas Fletcher went to Eton and Cambridge and took holy orders, dying rector of Hilgay, Norfolk, in 1649. His interesting work as a poet cannot concern us here, save for the observation that in him, as in his brother, in Browne, and in Wither, was continued the allegorical pastoral mode

[1] Grosart, *Phineas Fletcher*, iii, 7. Neither Smith nor Greg include *Sicelides* in their lists of English pastorals.

[2] This is gleaned from the title, though the date is not given. *Sicelides* was first printed in 1631, and Grosart thinks surreptitiously, "for a more incorrectly printed book," he tells us, "I have rarely met with." *Ibid.* 8.

[3] As to the several literary and clerical Fletchers, see Grosart, *ibid.* i, p. xx.

of Spenser. As to the authenticity of the piscatory eclogue in which the simple life of fishermen takes the place of shepherds and their flocks, it is sufficient to remind the reader of the *Egloga Pescatoria* of Sannazaro, 1526, the model of which was the twenty-first Idyl of Theocritus.[1] In *Sicelides*, Olinda, a fair maiden, is doomed, like Andromeda, to be devoured by a sea-monster, here called by the good old English word an "orke."[2] She is rescued by Thalander, a lover, now disguised, whom she had scorned. She is practiced against by Cosma, a wicked and envious witch; and oracles, wanderings, enchantments, and "desamours" (the opposite of love-philters) enter into the intricate plot. The pastoral types are easily recognized: Olinda is the chaste shepherdess; Thalander, the faithful lover; Cosma, the wanton; Cyclops, the satyr; and the "identification might be further pursued." *Sicelides* is never dramatic. Striking events are for the most part related, and the salient points of the plot rarely effectively used. The story, moreover, is obscure and involved, and to be extracted only by much rereading, while the comedy is for the most part ineffective buffoonery. And yet such is Fletcher's genuine poetic gift, his *naïveté*, his love of Nature and power to reach her charm, that *Sicelides* cannot but hold the regard of the lover of poetry. Phineas Fletcher was as aloof from the dramatic influences that were shaping the literature of his day as his cousin John Fletcher was active in modifying them. Spenser, alone of the poets of the

[1] Fletcher is himself the author of seven *Piscatory Eclogues* published with other poems in 1633.

[2] Ovid, *Metamorphoses*, xiv, is the basis of the story, but most of the episodes are original.

age, might have written *Sicelides*, nor would Fletcher's "piscatory" have been wholly unworthy of the author of *The Shepherd's Calendar*.[1]

Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, 1614–30.

In Ben Jonson's *Sad Shepherd* we reach the last play showing pastoral influences in the reign of King James; for it is impossible, despite much excellent ordering of probabilities, to think this exquisite fragment not rather a remnant of earlier times, left unfinished, or, if completed, negligently lost in part, than to accept it as a late experiment at a period when Jonson's genius, though not altogether fallen into dotage, as Dryden put it, was at least weakened by ill health and poverty and hardened, so far as the drama was concerned, into allegory and satire. Fleay, accepted by Symonds and Ward, identified *The Sad Shepherd* with "a pastorall intitled *The May Lord*," of which Jonson spoke to his friend Drummond in 1619, mentioning, besides, certain allegorical references to Sir Thomas Overbury and "Somerset's Lady," "that contrary to all other pastorals, he bringeth the clownes making mirth and foolish sport." [2] If this identification be accepted with the allusions which it involves, the play must belong about 1615 or, as Greg corrects, 1613.[3] This identification, however, has of late been denied on the ground that there is no reason to suppose *The May Lord* a dramatic production and on the proof that Fleay's correspondences are reducible, when all has been said, to the use of

[1] For the Latin pastorals of Samuel Brooke, Fletcher's friend, see p. 80. *Omphale, or the Inconstant Shepherdess*, by Richard Braithwaite, printed in 1623, is a pastoral poem, not a play.

[2] Fleay, i, 379–381; *Conversations*, 27.

[3] W. W. Greg, "Ben Jonson's Sad Shepherd," *Materialien zur Kunde*, 1905, xi, p. xviii.

the same name, Alkin or Alken, for a personage in both productions.[1] This is not the place in which to examine Greg's arguments in detail. He grants that "the date of *The Sad Shepherd* cannot be fixed with certainty," but inclines to place it "in the few years preceding Jonson's death." [2] Aside from the extraordinary contrast between the freshness and vivacity of *The Sad Shepherd* and Jonson's later masques and labored last plays, the general probabilities are against so late a date. Jonson was interested in the pastoral when he visited Drummond in 1619. This is shown in such passages as: "The most commonplace of his repetition was a dialogue pastoral between a shepherd and a shepherdess about singing;" and in his critique: "that Guarini, in his *Pastor Fido*, keept not decorum, in making shepherds speek as well as himself could." [3] Moreover, Jonson was still full of his animosity, personal and professional, towards Daniel, and it could have been no mere coincidence that Daniel's *Hymen's Triumph*, which is notable for its gravity and absence of humorous personages, as it is full of poetical apostrophes and expletives, should have extorted from Jonson's prologue such comments as his branding with the word "heresy, . . . that mirth by no means fits a pastoral;" and the thrust:

> "But that no style for pastoral should go
> Current, but what is stamped with Ah! and O!" [4]

A theory to vindicate and a foe to confound,—Jonson could have wanted no better opportunity for the writing of play or treatise. Let us leave Greg in his agnostic doubts and believe that whether *The May*

[1] *Ibid.* xv, xvi.
[2] *Ibid.* xx.
[3] *Conversations*, 4, 6.
[4] Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 385.

*Lord* "was to some extent connected in subject" with *The Sad Shepherd* or not, the latter work was substantially planned, if not wholly written, in the fragment which we possess, at least within the reign of King James and not improbably soon after the success at court of his rival's *Hymen's Triumph* in 1614.

Composite art of *The Sad Shepherd.*

*The Sad Shepherd* has already been described as bidding fair, had it proceeded to completeness, to realize most truly in our drama the traditional life of Robin Hood and his merry men. The witch, too, with her changes of shape to a raven, a hare, and to innocent Maid Marian, have already received our attention.[1] That these elements are foreign to the pastoral as conventionally conceived is obvious; but it is difficult for the non-impressionist critic to find any such "preposterous" and "irritating" incongruity, any such "inexcusable" and "inexplicable" artistic offense as Swinburne contrives to discover in all this.[2] The juxtaposition of the pastoral Æglamour, Robin Hood, and Puck-hairy under the beeches of Nottinghamshire seems hardly more startling than that of Titania, Theseus, and Bottom in the copses bordering a certain very unclassical Athens. Indeed, their fine names and the poetry of their lines alone ally Jonson's shepherds and shepherdesses with the old pastoral conventions. The freshness and naturalness with which the familiar figures of Robin and Marian and the witch of Paplewick with her lout of a son, Lorell, are drawn scarcely admit of too much praise. *The Sad Shepherd* is a refreshing piece of open-air realism and is entitled to a place in the drama of English folk-lore with

[1] Above, i, pp. 284, 360. [2] *Study of Ben Jonson*, 87.

*A Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Friar Bacon*, and *Old Fortunatus*.

In February, 1625, Sir Henry Herbert licensed *Love Tricks or the School of Complement*, the earliest comedy of James Shirley, and one which enjoyed success in its day and was revived after the Restoration.[1] *Love Tricks* is a composite of the comedy of manners, of disguise, and of romance, and involves pretty lyrics and poetical talk of the shepherd's ideals and a heroine "turned into breeches and become a shepherdess."[2] *The Careless Shepherdess* appears to have been a later work of Thomas Goffe, already mentioned above as the author of two sophomoric tragedies on Turkish history and a third on Orestes.[3] Goffe was born in 1592 and educated at Westminster. After leaving Oxford, in 1623, he resided until his death, in 1629, in Surrey, where he held the living of East Clandon; and it is to this period that the composition of his one pastoral drama must be referred. *The Careless Shepherdess* follows Daniel's theory concerning the rustic simplicity of the pastoral as well as Daniel's practice, which inconsistently observed the artificial ideals of Arcadia.[4] The play is not lacking in inventiveness, as, for example, the scene in which a threatened duel between two shepherds is frustrated by the threat of the shepherdesses involved to fight the duel themselves; and in that of the carrying off of all the characters by a tribe of satyrs, led by a banished shepherd turned outlaw.[5] Nor is

Shirley's *Love Tricks*, 1625.

Goffe's *Careless Shepherdess*, before 1629.

[1] As to Shirley, see below, pp. 131, 132, 284–297, 312–326.

[2] Dyce, *Shirley*, i, 37, 64–66, and 90 ff.

[3] Above, i, p. 449.

[4] See Goffe's prologue.

[5] IV, vii; v, i. As to source, Smith finds the oracle borrowed from D'Urfé's *L'Astrée*. *Pastoral Influence*, 417.

*The Careless Shepherdess* wanting, either in comedy or in poetry, of a certain prettiness. A greater infusion of the supernatural and of the comic expressed in prose are the chief innovations of Goffe's play, which was acted before the king and queen in 1629 and again in 1632.[1]

Minor "pastoral dramas" of the thirties.

With the thirties, the pastoral tragicomedy, as it was now preferably called, took a new lease of life, though usually varied by the admixture of elements foreign to its kind as originally conceived and practiced. Some twenty titles of plays of this general class find mention between 1630 and the closing of the theaters. Of these, three, a "*Play of Pastorall*" mentioned in a contemporary diary under date 1634, *Stonehenge*, by John Speed, acted at Cambridge in 1636, and the Latin *Silvia*, by Philip Kynder, of doubtful date, are no longer extant.[2] *Love's Victory*, anonymous and dating about 1630, has been described as "full of musical lines."[3] *The Converted Robber*, by George Wilde, 1637, lays its scene on Salisbury Plain, and is an honest if not very successful attempt to place the conventional pastoral in the midst of an English scene derived, like its poetry, from Spenser, not from nature.[4] *Actæon and Diana*, "with a pastoral story of the nymph Œnone," was acted at

[1] *Ibid.* 411–416 n.

[2] *Sir Humphrey Mildmay's Diary, Harleian MS.* 454, British Museum; Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ii, 660; Fleay, ii, 35, who refers to *MS. Ashmole*, 788.

[3] *Quaritch's Catalogue*, 194, p. 163.

[4] This was acted at St. John's College, Oxford, and remains extant. See Fleay, ii, 275. An account of this play will be found in "A History of Pastoral Drama in England until 1700," by J. Laidler, *Englische Studien*, xxxv, 234–236, an article curiously unaware of previous work on the subject.

the Red Bull about 1640 with Singing Simpson and Hobbinol the Shepherd in the cast.[1] And of much the same period must have been *Love in its Ecstasy or the Large Prerogative*, "a pastoral," the scene Lilybæus, by William Peaps, a student at Eton, perhaps never acted, and printed only in 1649.[2] Lastly, *Florimene* was presented in their own tongue by the French ladies in waiting upon Queen Henrietta Maria in December, 1635, only the descriptions being in English.[3] Of the remainder, *The Arcadia* of James Shirley, 1632, although modeled on Sidney's famous romance, and entitled a pastoral, scarcely belongs to this group any more than Day's *Isle of Gulls*, which drew upon the same source; *The Faithful Shepherd* by J. Sidnam," 1630, is a mere translation of Guarini; Heywood's beautiful *Love's Mistress*, 1634, though its scene is Arcadia, is a masque-like production of classical affiliations; and his *Amphrisa, the Forsaken Shepherd*, published in 1637, is a mere dialogue.[4]

Knevet's *Rhodon and Iris*, 1631.

*Rhodon and Iris*, presented at the Florists' Feast in Norwich, May 3, 1631, throws an interesting side light on the occasional drama of the day in the provinces. This pastoral was written by Ralph Knevet, a tutor or chaplain in the family of Sir William Paston of Oxmead, later rector of Lyng, Norfolk, and the author of some verses on various occasions besides this, his one play.[5] *Rhodon and Iris* is an attempt to

[1] Hazlitt, *Manual*, 2.

[2] Smith says of this play that it "reflects throughout the court atmosphere." *Pastoral Influence*, 391.

[3] Malone, *Variorum Shakespeare*, iii, 122 n.

[4] See above, p. 152.

[5] The best account of Knevet and his exceedingly rare play is

represent, under the guise of pastoral characters and situations, an allegory of "the relation and properties of various plants and flowers." The allegory, save at some obvious points, is beyond explanation, as is much of the satire, though some of it is reported to have involved the author in some question. In a simple story unfolded not without art, Knevet tells of the encroachments of Martagon, the red Lyly, a covetous shepherd, on the lands of the shepherdess Violetta, of her brother Rodon's (the rose's) defense, and the reconciliation of the opposed flowers, when about to join battle, by the goddess Flora. Except for this introduction of the element of war, the play is strictly a pastoral, presenting the usual contrasted lovers and tender episodes. The plot of Poneria and Agnostus (Envy and Ignorance) to disturb alike the "flowers" and the feast seems suggested by the similar abstractions of the prologue of Daniel's *Hymen's Triumph*. The substitution of a poisoned draught for a love-philter recalls the "desamour" of *Sicelides*, though questionless both go back to medieval story. We may accept Knevet's naïve confession, "that he no small foole is, though a small poet," but only as to the latter half; for his play, if lacking in poetry and decidedly unsteady in its verse, is originally planned, and by no means unsuccessfully carried out. Another provincial and occasional pastoral was John Tatham's *Love Crowns the End*, acted by the scholars of Bingham in Nottinghamshire in 1632. Tatham, later to follow Munday, Middleton, and Heywood as "laureate of the lord mayors' shows," was at this time but twenty years of age. His pastoral represents, in the words of

Tatham's *Love Crowns the End*, 1632.

Professor Smith's *Pastoral Influence*, 428–437. Knevet's play was printed in the year of its production.

Winstanley, an "early blossom of not altogether contemptible poetry," and, crowded with action carried on by the usual pastoral types, with which mingle at one point "a heavenly messenger" and the Destinies, is over before we are well into it.[1]

*The Shepherds' Paradise*, 1632; acted by the queen and her ladies;

Several circumstances conspire to give a fortuitous interest to the exceedingly dull, obscure, and lengthy prose pastoral drama, *The Shepherds' Paradise*, which has been not inaptly described as "a courtier's dream of Utopia written in the pastoral mode." [2] The author was Walter Montague, second son of the Earl of Manchester, who had been employed by Buckingham to negotiate the marriage of Prince Charles to the Princess Henrietta Maria. Montague had resided much in France, and later than the date of this, his one play, embraced the Roman Catholic faith and became a French cardinal. In 1632, when *The Shepherds' Paradise* was rehearsing at court, Montague was the trusted attendant and friend of the queen. His play, which is clearly modeled on the later French pastoral romances, of which the best known is D'Urfé's *L'Astrée*, was intended for little more than a court exercise in which her majesty, with her court ladies, might practice English, that difficult tongue for Gallic lips. As luck would have it, Prynne at that moment was writing his portentous *Histriomastix*,[3] and, according to his defense, had long before penned the notorious passage wherein he declares that "St. Paul prohibits women to speak publicly in the church,

its relation to *Histriomastix*.

[1] Winstanley, *Lives of the Most Famous English Poets*, 1687, p. 190.

[2] Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 438. Langbaine, 377, calls this play by mistake *The Shepherds' Oracle*.

[3] On Prynne and his book, see above, pp. 88, 89.

and dares any Christian woman [to] be so more than whorishly impudent, as to act [or] to speak publicly on a stage." [1] The application was all too perfect; and the severity of Prynne's punishment was immediately consequent upon this insult.[2]

Randolph's *Amyntas*, before 1635.

Of Thomas Randolph, chief of university dramatists, his wit and his promise, we have already heard.[3] His one venture into pastoral drama, *Amyntas or the Impossible Dowry*, is the most finished of his plays, and for its poetry, its wit, excellent construction, and characterization deserves a place beside the best of its class. Once more, as with Daniel and Goffe, we have the familiar apology for the rudeness of pastoral dialogue and manners, and once more we meet with both conduct and dialogue of courtly polish and grace.[4] *Amyntas* is of very complicated construction, but exceedingly well-managed, if we admit the artificiality of the two oracles on which the action is founded. The play combines the story of the merry shepherdess, Laurinda, unable to choose between two lovers who are friends, with that of Amyntas, gone mad in his attempt to guess the "impossible dowry." An embroidery of light comedy in the hands of a sprightly page, a foolish knight, and a doltish shepherd, knighted by supposed fairies (really boys engaged in robbing an orchard), add to the liveliness of the scenes. It is not impossible that much of this comedy had a definite meaning to the auditors of the day, now evaporated

[1] *Histriomastix*, the Table, under "Women-actors;" and see *ibid.* 214, 414. See, also, *Life and Times of Charles I*, i, 223–224.

[2] Thompson, *The Controversy Between the Puritans and the Stage*, 176.

[3] Above, pp. 85–87.

[4] See prologue of *Amyntas*, and compare with those of *Hymen's Triumph* and *The Careless Shepherdess*.

as most contemporary allusion evaporates. *Amyntas* is written in fluent blank verse, thus differing from the riming couplets and alternates common to its kind. The songs of the schoolboy fairies are, appropriately enough for the age, in Latin. Randolph's powers lie in his wit and in his grace, in ability to bring out the possibilities of a dramatic situation, and, on occasion, in his genuine pathos. Brighter and mentally more agile than Daniel, Randolph is no less a poet, and in suggestion of character and construction of plot is the better dramatist. Though yielding in poetry to the finest passages of *The Faithful Shepherdess*, Randolph's plotting is more natural, and he escapes Fletcher's darling sin, effect emphasized by exaggerated contrast. One must profess to a nicer appreciation of the delicate beauties of Italian pastoral poetry than is often vouchsafed even to the diligent student not to the manor born to deny the judgment of Halliwell-Phillipps that Randolph's *Amyntas* partakes "of the best properties of Guarini's and Tasso's poetry without being a servile imitation of either." [1]

Rutter's *Shepherds' Holiday*, c. 1634.

It seems not unlikely that *The Shepherds' Holiday*, assigned to Joseph Rutter, and acted about 1634, was written in emulation, if not in imitation of *Amyntas*. Here, too, a complicated and original plot involving the fortunes of three pairs of lovers is made to depend on two oracles of the customary obscurity; but a motive involving lost children, as in *The Winter's Tale*, —a prince here being reared a shepherd and the oracle fulfilled by his discovery,—is interwoven with the prevailing pastoral motive. Rutter was a member of Jonson's latest circle of wits and poets. Jonson pre-

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Dictionary*, 16.

fixed the seal of his approval in a few commendatory lines to this play, and Rutter was among the many poets to join in that ample tribute to Jonson's memory, *Jonsonus Virbius*.[1] As to *The Shepherds' Holiday*, it is an estimable piece of work not wanting in dramatic power or poetic embellishment; and it enjoyed some popularity in its day, being acted not only at Whitehall before their majesties, but likewise "at the Cockpit." [2] Of much the same date, too, is Cowley's *Love's Riddle*, "written at the time of his being king's scholar in Westminster School," and therefore before that precocious youth had completed his eighteenth year. *Love's Riddle* is built about the adventures which arise out of a gentlewoman's flight to the country and disguise as a young shepherd, to escape an importunate suitor, with the search for her among the shepherds by her brother and her lover. The usual pastoral types occur with some additions, such as Alupis, a species of merry pastoral Jaques. Although the prologue informs us "'t was a word stolen from cat and ball," this comedy, judged with its kind, stands in no need of any allowance for the author's youth.

Cowley's *Love's Riddle*, c. 1635.

With Henry Glapthorne's *Argalus and Parthenia*, and *Love's Labyrinth*, "by Thomas Forde, Philothal," as the title has it, we bring this tale of the English pastoral drama to a close. In the former play Glapthorne has once more levied on Sidney's *Arcadia*, that favorite quarry for dramatists, but has subordi-

*Argalus and Parthenia*, printed 1639.

[1] Rutter was tutor to the Earl of Dorset, afterwards so overpraised by Dryden.

[2] Some suggestions as to allusions by Fleay and Hazlitt in this play may be found with sufficient answers in Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 426.

nated the pastoral scenes to those of the court and the tilting ground.[1] This play rises to effectiveness in the scene of the duel between Argalus and Amphialus and exhibits, perhaps better than most of his plays, the fluency and florid eloquence which distinguish its author. *Argalus and Parthenia* is conspicuous among plays of its type for its tragic ending. *Love's Labyrinth* preserves far more the pastoral atmosphere, and is a close and poetical dramatic rendering of Robert Greene's pretty prose romance, *Menaphon*, a story not unlike in its general characteristics to *Pandosto* of the same writer, whence was derived the plot of *The Winter's Tale*.[2] *Love's Labyrinth* was first published in the year of the Restoration, and it is uncertain if it was acted at all. "Thomas Forde, Philothal," seems to be capable of identification neither with the musician nor with the Puritan divine of that name.

*Love's Labyrinth*, written before 1642.

In the foregoing pages we have found the pastoral drama in England a later offshoot of the pastoral mode as exemplified in narrative eclogue, lyric, and prose romance. While its direct model is unquestionably the pastoral literature of Italy, we cannot but recognize the complete analogy between the development of this mode of the drama in England and in Italy, how in both countries it was preceded by the pastoral address of welcome or dialogue forming a part of some entertainment of the nobility or of royalty, and how by these means the dramatic element was gradually evolved. English pastoral plays exhibit a very narrow

Foreign sources of English pastoral drama.

[1] These are chiefly I, ii ; II, ii ; and IV, i.

[2] I cannot see what causes Halliwell-Phillipps to find any resemblance between *Love's Labyrinth* and Gomersal's *Sforza*, a drama of totally different type. See his *Dictionary of English Plays*, 155.

range of sources. Sannazaro's romance and the two pastoral plays of Tasso and Guarini exhaust the list as to Italy, unless we consider such negligible matters as the two Latin plays, *Parthenia* of doubtful date and unknown authorship, said to be a translation of Groto's *Pentimento Amoroso*, and *Scyros* by Samuel Brooke, acted at Cambridge in 1612, and not impossibly a similar translation or adaptation of Bonarelli's *Filli di Sciro*.[1] As to French influences, Homer Smith has noted traces of *L'Astrée* in both *Hymen's Triumph* and Goffe's *Careless Shepherdess;*[2] and it can hardly be questioned that to D'Urfé's famous romance Montague owes not a little of the interminable listlessness of his prosaic *Shepherd's Paradise*, though a definite resemblance may not be traceable between it and either of the two main plots or the thirty-three long episodes of *L'Astrée*.[3] It may be doubted if any English play owes anything directly to the Portuguese Montemayor's romance of pastoral intrigue, *La Diana*, 1559, which imitated in the language of Castile the *Arcadia* of Sannazaro. Lastly, as to sources in English, the materials which Shakespeare found in Lodge's and Greene's romances are well known; almost the latest play in our list of pastorals, Ford's *Love's Labyrinth*, returned, as we have seen, to Greene as a source; whilst Sidney's *Arcadia* with its

Its sources in English literature.

[1] See Greg, *Pastoral*, 251; another translation was made in 1655 "by J. S." under the title *Phillis of Scyros*.

[2] Smith, 404, 417. The French *Florimene* has already been mentioned.

[3] Dunlop, *History of Fiction*, iii, 159. *Honor's Academy or the Famous Pastoral of the Fair Shepherdess Julietta*, by Nicholas of Montreux, was translated in 1610 by Robert Tofte, but is not a drama. The several pastoral plays of Montreux seem to have remained unknown in England.

intricate wealth of adventure is levied on again and again for subject, though the dramas which it has thus furnished are by no means of a prevailingly pastoral kind.[1]

English pastoral drama not limited to Italian ideals.

If the absolute criteria of pastoral drama as practiced by Tasso and Guarini be taken as our standard and guide, we must accept the rigid classification of Smith and find in the pastorals of Daniel, John Fletcher, Goffe, Knevet, Montague, Randolph, Rutter, and Cowley the only true examples of the type.[2] But aside from the admission of *Sicelides*, the piscatory of Phineas Fletcher, in accord with the usage in eclogue of Sannazaro himself, the pastoral romances and dramas of Italy are full of the admixture of intrigue, of life at court, of comedy relief, and other material such as the supernatural and mythological, so that these distinctions of the critics must be pronounced artificial at best.[3]

English contribution to it.

The one distinctively English contribution to pastoral drama, considered largely, is the freebooting life under the greenwood tree, with its joyous humor, its honest give and take, its manly sense of individual right and worth, all as distinct from the gentleman in trouble turned robber or the misanthrope become a hermit, as it is remote from the artificial pathos and the trivial sentimentalities of

[1] Among plays of this general type owing something to the *Arcadia* are *Argalus and Parthenia*, *The Isle of Gulls*, Shirley's *Arcadia*, and *Mucedorus*. Besides this, *Cupid's Revenge*, and the late tragicomedy *Andromana*, with the underplot of *Lear* and many suggestions of the horrors in *The Duchess of Malfi*, all levy on *The Arcadia*. Cf. above, i, p. 241, for mention of an unpublished thesis on this topic.

[2] Smith, 392.

[3] See, in general, the liberal attitude of Greg in his *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*.

the exotic pastoral. England needed not to go to Italy for love of nature, country mirth, or representations of the honest love of man and maid. When all has been said, the pastoral remains "a cockney's idea of the country," or rather a courtier's refinement on the cockney's ignorant ideal. It is no accident that the pastoral continued for years beyond our period in great popularity and played its part in aiding the decay of the virile drama of old time, with tragicomedy, heroic-play, and that dramatic inanity, the opera. Nor is it an accident that the writers of the conventional pastoral should have been, in the period of our discussion, a fastidious court poet, a queen's usher, several witty and poetical collegians, and a precocious boy. Fletcher was "gentle" enough to appreciate in his *Faithful Shepherdess* the pastoral mode in all its conventionality, though he could destroy the ultimate effectiveness of a beautiful play by a method of contrast too coarse for the delicate artificiality of his subject. Lyly had mythologized the pastoral, as Knevet later elaborately allegorized it. Day and Shirley used it to brighten their lightsome comedies of intrigue; and Daborne to heighten the humble worth of his *Poor Man*. Although the poet in Jonson accepted the ideals of Arcadia in his *Sad Shepherd*, the realist demanded a transference of the denizens of that imaginary country to a home beneath the English beeches of Sherwood Forest, as the moralist substituted for dainty amorous dialogue and intrigue a struggle between the powers of virtue, represented in Robin and his Maid Marian, and the machinations of the Witch of Paplewick. But here, as everywhere, we must turn back to Shakespeare if we would know the possibilities of that veritable golden age that visits

Summary of English pastoral dramatists.

in momentary gleams the hearts of young lovers and sends a far beam into the reminiscent ponderings of later years. We may live, if we will, in the golden age with Perdita and Florizel, and in an Arcadia less open to cavil than the seacoast which borders it. But the true attitude towards Arcadia and all its sentimental residents is that of adorable Rosalind, whose Arcadian wooing is like a daintily affected robe clothing a fresh, young beauty, worn less as a garment than as an allurement, yet nothing except for the exquisite form that it clothes.

## XVII

### TRAGICOMEDY AND "ROMANCE"

Tragicomedy.

THE term tragicomedy in the abstract is a misnomer, and involves a contradiction; for the dramatic conflict between the will of the protagonist and universal law cannot be conceived of as at once a triumph and an overthrow for each of the contending principles. Nor can the mere infusion of a comic episode or two, or even the relief of a somber tragic plot by an underplot of comedy be said logically to justify the appellation tragicomedy. None the less, both the word, tragicomedy, and the thing are to be reckoned with; for the Jacobeans themselves employed this dubious term to denote a romantic drama involving serious passion, yet ending happily; and this species of play speedily acquired a popularity above all other kinds of drama. Tragicomedy is not necessarily melodrama, but it may readily degenerate into such. Its besetting sins are false sentiment and a sacrifice of dramatic logic to surprise, perverted ethics, and an overthrow of the laws of cause and effect. As early as Greene's *James IV of Scotland* (1590), we have a romantic story rising almost to tragedy, yet ending in reconciliation; and Marston's fine comedy, *The Malcontent* (1601), might readily have reached a violent *dénouement*, in place of its skillful unravelment of intrigue. In later times, Suckling actually wrote his *Aglaura* (printed in 1638) as a tragedy with an alternative fifth act ending happily, as Kipling

rewrote his novel, *The Light That Failed*. The truest tragicomedy is that which trembles between a tragical and a happy solution, as do the later acts of *Measure for Measure*, or *The Merchant of Venice* in that supreme moment when Shylock elects submission, though freely offered his heart's revenge.

Deepened comedy and the drama of reconcilement.

It is unnecessary to cite Greek analogues or Italian examples for the use of comedy in serious drama for relief; for no practice of English drama is more definitely established or earlier in origin than this. Tragicomedy may result in two ways: by deepening the situation of comedy into serious mood by the infusion of a sentimental or a pathetic interest; or by the resolution of a situation essentially tragic into reconciliation. For example, our interest in the secret love of Shakespeare's Viola for Duke Orsino is sentimental, as our interest in Patient Grissel arises from the pathos of her situation. On the other hand, had Angelo indeed committed the crimes which he had contrived and, as he thought, committed, *Measure for Measure* must have ended in tragedy. The resolution of tragicomedy is at times a compromise. In *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* Massinger so adjusts the usual happy ending, inflicting madness on Sir Giles Overreach, whose name describes his nature, and sending the spendthrift, Welborn, abroad to the wars to regain his lost credit as a man. It is in the resolution of a tragic situation into reconciliation instead of Nemesis that the ethical lapses of the writers of tragicomedy are most frequent. Sometimes, as in *A King and No King*, the action turns on what proves to have been a mistake, here the supposed consanguinity of Arbases and Panthea; at other times the condoning of sin or of unpardonable conduct — for example,

that of Lelia in *The Captain*,[1] or the crime of Albert against his friend Carracus in *The Hog Hath Lost His Pearl*[2]—stains the comedy with a tragic coloring and shakes the ethical equilibrium of the play to its damage as an artistic product.

Tragicomedy, realistic and romantic;

Tragicomedy may be either realistic or romantic. The former is commonly of the domestic type or closely allied to the comedy of manners. The earlier specimens of these kinds have already received our attention.[3] Neither was so differentiated from the tragedies or comedies of its class as to demand a separate consideration. Moreover, the later comedy of manners will claim the next chapter. Romantic tragicomedy, on the contrary, developed several distinct species, foremost among them the "romance," as it has not altogether happily been called,—a variety of play which claimed Shakespeare in the last years of his activity and laid the foundations on which Davenant and Dryden were later to rear that fantastic rococo structure known as the Restoration heroic play. Tragicomedy originated very definitely towards the end of the first decade of the reign of King James and in the hands of a well-known group of playwrights. A digression into their literary relations at this point seems demanded by the subject.

the "romance."

Beaumont and Fletcher; their relations to each other and to other dramatists.

The names of Beaumont and Fletcher have already recurred again and again in these pages, and no less than thirty of the fifty-four plays popularly ascribed to their joint authorship have already received a full

[1] Lelia is not only an undutiful daughter to her father in his poverty, but on his obtaining unexpected fortune is represented as courting him lustfully. See I, iii, and IV, v.

[2] Albert, under cover of darkness, usurps the place of a bridegroom, his friend, yet is in the end forgiven.

[3] Above, i, pp. 330–339.

or a cursory attention.[1] The chief facts in the lives of these poets, too, have been stated;[2] and as to their authorship, we have noted it as probable that they began independently and each with comedies of manners, Fletcher leaning to that direct picturing of London life which we associate at its best with the name of Middleton; Beaumont showing the tendency to satire which distinguishes Jonsonian comedy with a quality of burlesque quite his own.[3] We have seen Beaumont preparing a masque for the Inner Temple and Gray's Inn, in the staging of which at Whitehall, February 20, 1613, the long experience and interest of Sir Francis Bacon in such things must have proved invaluable.[4] Beaumont wrote this masque in his capacity as a member of the Inner Temple, just as Bacon had helped stage it and provide for the expenses in his capacity of a member of Gray's Inn. This masque was printed in quarto not long after performance, but without the name of the author on the title-page. A like omission characterizes the five plays (all attributed to Beaumont and Fletcher in the folio of 1647), which were published before 1616, the year of Beaumont's death.[5] It seems plain, then, that all the plays in which Beaumont had a hand were written before his retirement in the year 1611 or 1612, and that the *Masque* is the latest production of Beaumont's pen. It seems equally clear that Beaumont collaborated with no one save Fletcher. On the other hand, Fletcher's literary activity continued up to the time of his death by the plague in 1625; and he collaborated certainly with Massinger and Field, and

[1] Cf. especially, i, pp. 400–402, 525–529; ii, 37–42.
[2] Above, i, pp. 523–525. [3] i, p. 526. [4] ii, pp. 116, 117.
[5] Macaulay, *Francis Beaumont*, 32; Fleay, i, 175.

perhaps with Shakespeare and Middleton. During this period plays singly Beaumont's and jointly Beaumont's and Fletcher's were freely revised by Fletcher alone or with the help of others; and finally, both before and after Fletcher's death, the work which had gone before was as freely revised by Massinger, again at times doubtless with other help. Few problems connected with our old drama are so intricate and perhaps ultimately so hopeless, yet few are more alluring.[1] It may be permitted the conservative scholar to question some of the "certainties" of previous workers without daring new surmises of his own.

Internal tests of authorship;

As external evidence respecting the chronology and authorship of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays is to a large degree conflicting, great reliance has been placed on such evidence as may be gleaned from contrast in verse, style, conception of character, and other qualities in which these authors are found to be distinguishable. Thus Fletcher differs from all his contemporaries in his practice of a variety of blank verse notable for great license as to the use of redundant syllables, especially at the end of the line, yet strict beyond the later practice of Shakespeare in bringing the pause in sense for the most part at the end of each verse. The end-stopped hendecasyllabic line, as it is technically called, is then the mark of Fletcher, and it is prevailingly used by him with such ease, rapidity, and naturalness that it has been justly called "the best substitute for prose that verse has yet given us." [2] But Fletcher's verse is only the chief

the "notes" of Fletcher;

[1] For the bibliography of this subject, see the Bibliographical Essay at the end of this volume.

[2] Oliphant, "The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher," *Englische Studien*, xiv, 59.

of several devices by which he sought to give to dramatic dialogue a rapid and colloquial quality and yet preserve to it the plasticity and musical character of verse. Fletcher's construction is loose, his sentences cumulative and rambling, and he abuses at times the device of repetition. Naturally such a verse and such a style serve as a compromise between verse and prose. The latter Fletcher uses seldom; rime almost never. Though in no wise so conspicuously at variance with others, the verse of Beaumont is measurably strict as to its decasyllabic character; it uses with moderation that freedom of phrasing which carries the thought over the limit of the line, employing the light ending, as does Shakespeare, inserting an occasional Alexandrine if need be, and not disdaining the use of rime, often in the midst of blank verse, or, for variety, even of prose.[1] Mannerisms in "the use of the enclitic *do*," in a fondness for enumeration, and the omission of particles such as prepositions and conjunctions have also been observed, as among the "notes" of Beaumont.[2] Distinguishable from these qualities of either of the earlier dramatists is the verse of Massinger for its evenness and freedom from the licenses of the extra syllable and inverted foot, so common in later Shakespearean verse. Massinger rates his syllables at their full value, rarely contracting a word, and often expanding it in violence to common hurried utterance.[3] Like Fletcher, Massinger uses prose and less rime except at the conclusion

the "notes" of Beaumont;

Massinger's "notes."

[1] *Ibid.* 60. Fleay denies that Fletcher uses prose. See *New Shakspere Society's Translations*, 1874, p. 53.

[2] *Ibid.* 66.

[3] "Your reputation shall stand as fair
In all men's good opinion as now."
*A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, IV, i.

of scenes. He also adopted Fletcher's double endings to a certain degree. Weak endings are common, and combining as they often do with run-on lines and their attendant pauses within the line, produce at times a verse fiberless and approaching prose. Lastly, Massinger's style is less easy and colloquial than either Beaumont's or Fletcher's, more apt to become rhetorical and stiff in manner, repetitious in certain phrases, measured, premeditated, and unimpassioned.[1]

Oliphant on the deeper distinctions of these dramatists.

But there are deeper distinctions than these of mere form. Oliphant accuses Fletcher of a want of artistic earnestness, of the truth of the teacher and the wisdom of the philosopher, and contrasts him, to his discredit, with "the true Elizabethans." The critic grants Fletcher "a pretty, playful fancy," genuine humor and wit, a certain superficial insight into human character, and designates his art by the adjectives ready, clever, off-hand, hurried, and careless. To Beaumont he grants a higher order of humor, "a playful jollity and good-natured satire" tending to burlesque, a genius for tragedy, power of pathos, sentiment, and an understanding of womanly nature. Massinger is rated even lower than Fletcher, and, while allowed a good playwright, is found eloquent without pathos, equal without superior excellence, and moral without ethical enthusiasm. Massinger is argumentative, lacking in variety of style and in that power to fit sentiment to the dramatic speaker. But while he never soars, he rarely falls, and adequacy, equability, and moderation remain alike his distinctive excellences and his greatest defects.[2] Into

[1] Oliphant, 72, to whom I acknowledge my indebtedness in this paragraph and the next.

[2] *Ibid.* xiv, 60–76.

discussion of the characters and types developed by these dramatists we need not enter here. This subject has already claimed our attention, and something will remain for summary.[1]

Difficulties in the application of these distinctions.

While the general truth of all these distinctions is not to be denied, the application of them to specific cases has been attended with so many differences, with such occasional acrimony, and with results so diverse, that the actual service of much of this work to the history of Elizabethan drama has been obscured and discredited. Macaulay gave to Beaumont, in whole or in part, fourteen plays which he distributed between 1607 and 1613.[2] Oliphant found Beaumont in twenty-one plays between 1604 and 1611, making an average of three plays per annum.[3] Shakespeare's average is less than two, and Shakespeare was a professional; Beaumont never claimed more than an amateur standing. Aside from the question who held the pen, and how far clever and adaptable men such as these might be affected by each other's art,— pertinent questions in all such cases,— it seems likely that Beaumont has been credited with rather more part in these plays than may have been actually his, that Massinger's revisions have at times been somewhat too subtly traced, and that unquestionably Fletcher's is the main hand in the large majority of the dramas that appear as his and Beaumont's jointly.

Stage history of Beaumont and Fletcher.

In addition to the other difficulties with these authors, the stage history of the earlier versions of their plays is far from clear. Oliphant surmises that Beaumont alone, and occasionally with Fletcher, first wrote for the Children of Paul's from about 1604 to

[1] See i, p. 602 ; ii, pp. 195, 197, 250.

[2] Macaulay, 195.

[3] Oliphant, xvi, 198.

1606 or 1607; that Fletcher's earliest unaided work was for the Children of his Majesty's Revels, to which Beaumont may occasionally have contributed during the three succeeding years; that in 1610 both authors went over to the King's company; and that Beaumont ceasing to write after that date, practically all the rest of Fletcher, with or without Massinger's revisions, was work done for this, the chief theatrical company of its time.[1] Oliphant also recognizes a later period of Sheakespeare-Fletcher activity in 1612–13, to which belong the lost *Cardenio*, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and *All is True* or *Henry VIII*.[2] Fleay's account is not very different in the main. He supposes Beaumont the author of only one play, *The Woman Hater*, for the Paul's boys; considers Ben Jonson the introducer of both the younger dramatists to the London stage; he thinks that both were writing for the Children of the Revels in 1608–09, and for Rossiter's new company in 1610; and finally that Beaumont with Jonson succeeded Shakespeare on his retirement in 1610, as one of the chief dramatic writers of the King's players.[3]

Varieties of romantic drama already described.

Returning from this digression to the romantic drama at large, among romantic plays thus far described several types have stood out with distinctness. We had first the early heroical plays of the seventies that traced their origin back to the medieval romances, and we found a recrudescence of this kind of drama in the early nineties.[4] We had, secondly, the conqueror plays of *Tamburlaine* type in the decade following the

[1] *Ibid.*; see the table on pp. 198–200.

[2] *Ibid.* 200; as to *Cardenio*, see below, pp. 212, 213.

[3] Fleay, i, 169, 170.

[4] See i, pp. 193–208. Greene's *Orlando* is type of the heroical romance dramatized.

*Armada* and the innumerable historical dramas, in which the perennial element of strangeness played its part in the total effect, following after.[1] Again, there was the play of travel and adventure wherein familiar Elizabethan figures were transported to foreign lands in which the fancy might play what pranks it could devise.[2] And there was the interesting group of comedies and tragedies that ideally treated themes of the supernatural.[3] Finally, there was the tragedy of revenge and intrigue in a succession of varieties; while through all this turbid and eddying backwater ran the pure and limpid stream of simple romantic art, telling again and again the time-honored tales of Italy, their beauty perennially renewed in the telling.

Elizabethan, and later romantic drama contrasted.

Now these groups of plays, considered in bulk as constituting the romantic drama of the age up to the earlier years of the reign of King James, have certain traits in common which are distinguishable from many characteristics that developed later. Briefly to name some of them, strictly Elizabethan romantic drama was characterized by an unoriginality of subject-matter and, outside of the heroical romance and plays involving adventure and the supernatural, by a general adherence to the course of human experience and to contemporary manners. It was fond of Italian names and places, but often preserved the local flavor of a particular source, thus producing a fine verisimilitude of life. While as delighted as any age in great names and maintaining, for the most part, the Shakespearean penchant for dukes and kings, this drama did not wholly lose sight of common humanity nor

[1] See i, pp. 226–229.

[2] i, pp. 291–293; typically represented in Day's *Travails of Three English Brothers*.

[3] See i, pp. 353–364, 385, 386.

arrange the dramatic importance of its characters on the order of their precedence in the royal antechamber. Again, many of the greatest tragedies of the Elizabethan age are constructed about a central idea, — the loves of Romeo and Juliet, the revenge of Hieronimo, the ambition of Tamburlaine. Even the comedies share in this trait, — the taming of Katharine, the subjection of Benedick and Beatrice to love. Finally, save for the heroic romance and the tragedy of revenge, the *dramatis personae* of these older and strictly Elizabethan plays tend marvelously little to the development of mere types or to the recurrence of similar situations. In the later romantic drama, whether tragic, comic, or tragicomic, on the other hand, nearly all of this is changed. The plots of the new tragicomedies are often original and commonly ingenious to the degree of improbability. Their places of action are not tied to the scene of any age. The new tragedy and tragicomedy adheres to kings and princes, whom it endows with heroic qualities; and crowds its background with imaginary conquests, usurpations, rebellions, and intrigues, free from the slightest reference to events by the most indulgent called historical. In place of unity of design in plot, this new romantic drama offers multiplicity, surprise, and contrast. Its situations and personages become in time conventionalized into types, even if they do follow, in the better plays, in kaleidoscopic succession. Tragicomedy, in short, affords an ollapodrida of dramatic entertainment in a no man's land as distinctive in its geographical features, in the flora of its heroic virtues and the fauna of its superhuman passions, as was ever Utopia, Arcadia, or other land of philosophers or poets.

The *Philaster* group.

One of the latest of commentators on Beaumont and Fletcher places among the works of these authors "surely acted by the end of 1611," four which "present a definite type."[1] These are *Philaster*, *The Maid's Tragedy*, *Cupid's Revenge*, and *A King and No King*. To these he adds two more, which he assigns likewise to this period, *Four Plays in One*, and *Thierry and Theodoret*. The first of the two productions last mentioned is a composite of two short comedies, a tragedy, and a morality.[2] There is a touch of the heroical in the opening comedy, but three of these plays are borrowed very closely from the time-honored quarries of Boccaccio and Bandello, and "the moral" "seems traceable to Lucian's dialogue of *Timon*." It is difficult to associate the conventionally romantic *Four Plays* with *Philaster*. As to *Thierry and Theodoret*, the reference of this tragedy, as we have seen, to historical events of the year 1617 in France disposes of such theorizing as to early date;[3] whilst the tragic character of this play, of *The Maid's Tragedy*, and of *Cupid's Revenge*, take all three out of our immediate category of tragicomedy. *Philaster* and *King and No King* remain typically to fulfill the conditions at once of tragicomedy and of the new dramatic "romance," although it is not to be denied that many other romantic tragedies and tragicomedies that go under the name of Beaumont and Fletcher exhibit qualities first recognizable to the degree of a distinct species in *Philaster*.

*Philaster*, c. 1609.

The outward history of *Philaster or Love Lies a Bleeding* is brief. It was first printed in 1620 as "acted

[1] A. H. Thorndike, *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 1901, p. 94.

[2] Cf. i, p. 401.

[3] Cf. above, i, p. 423.

at the Globe by his Majestie's Servants;" but John Davies of Hereford refers to it in an epigram of 1610.[1] The play was doubtless already at that date extremely popular, and was perhaps written — Beaumont certainly sharing in its authorship — a year or two before. The actual source of the story of Philaster has not yet been pointed out, although its reminiscences of the older drama are as unmistakable as they are above the cavil of the keenest scented detector of literary borrowings.[2] The scene of *Philaster* is Messina, but its *locus* is indeterminate; its immediate setting is the court. The background suggests a prince, true heir to the crown and beloved by the people. In opposition stands the usurping king, who seeks by allying his daughter to the Prince of Spain, the perpetuation of his usurpation. The Princess Arethusa is thus provided with two suitors, Pharamond, the Spanish prince, a poltroon, voluptuous and ignoble, whom she detests, and Philaster, noble, generous, honorable, her true lover, but quick to suspect and impetuous in tongue and action. On Philaster's side is the page Bellario (in reality the love-lorn maiden, Euphrasia), content to serve her beloved prince unknown; by him, unknowing, preferred to

[1] John Davies of Hereford, *Scourge of Folly*, Epigram 206; but see *Variorum Beaumont and Fletcher*, 1904, i, 117.

[2] The story of the girl-page, Bellario-Euphrasia, is paralleled in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, in Daiphantus of Sidney's *Arcadia*, and in the character Felismena of the *Diana* of Montemayor. Moreover, besides Yonge's translation of this last, this version was treated in a play by Munday, a good Spanish scholar, in 1584. To this list of possible suggestions for this story, Dr. Rosenbach, in a manuscript on *Spanish Influences on Fletcher*, to be noticed below, adds the *Comedia de los Engaños* by Lope de Rueda, printed at Seville in 1576. None of these stories conclude with the pathos of Euphrasia's renunciation.

the service of his lady Arethusa. Here is opportunity for infinite variation on the theme of pure love, requited and unrequited. On the other hand appear Pharamond and the wanton Megra, who present, in their gross amour discovered, the contrasted sensual passion, and in revenge develop the motives of suspicion and jealousy which separate and for a time estrange Arethusa and her lover. In a word, we have here a comedy of sentimental interest thrust into the midst of elements heroically tragic. Rapid continuity of action and variety of emotion, complexity of situation, and effective dramatic surprise are the result. As for the personages, they are drawn in black and white, and each salient trait is emphasized for contrast. The plot is too rapid for growth of character, and too varied for complexity of nature. Types are the inevitable result.

Types in *Philaster*.

*Philaster* gave English drama several typical personages: Bellario-Euphrasia, the love-lorn maiden, sentimental victim of unrequited love; Philaster, the "lily-livered hero," as Oliphant calls him, endowed with every masculine virtue save common sense; Dion, the faithful friend, blunt, humorous, cynical, impatient of inaction; Pharamond, the poltroon, a more or less humorous boaster and coward, lecherous, and a scoundrel. The evil woman has sometimes been added to the list, but Megra is a slight sketch in comparison with the wicked queens of older romantic tragedy; and the royal tempter and betrayer of woman, though a favorite figure of Fletcher's, comes not into the drama with *The Maid's Tragedy*. With these strictures on the characters, later to become the stock figures of the stage, and a recognition of the purely artificial fabric of its plot, all criticism of

*Philaster* ceases. For ease and rapidity of action, perfect adaptation to the needs of the stage, originality of situation, and admirably sustained dramatic interest *Philaster* has never been surpassed. While throughout it all its authors show that mastery of poetry and power over the adequate phrase which is one of the most precious of their manifold gifts.

*A King and No King*, 1611.

*A King and No King* was licensed in 1611 and acted at court in December of that year; it was not printed until 1619, but, like *Philaster*, appeared in several later quartos. It is unquestionably the work of both Beaumont and Fletcher. Between *Philaster* and *A King and No King*, *The Maid's Tragedy* had appeared, an adaptation to the sterner form of drama of the swift and inventive plot and the typical characters of the earlier tragicomedy.[1] *A King and No King* is a no less successful play, but here the heroic unreason and headstrong passion of Arbaces is exaggerated almost to the verge of the ridiculous, and the play is ethically impaired by the revolting motive on which the whole action turns, the supposedly incestuous passion of Arbaces and his sister Penthea. Though both maintained a struggle against their infatuation, dramatic ethics are not satisfied with the *dénouement*, wherein Arbaces turns out to be neither a king nor of kin to Penthea.

An elaborate monograph of Thorndike dilates on the likenesses and typical qualities of the characters of these three plays.[2] And that they have much in

[1] Amintor equals Philaster; Melantius, Dion; Evadne, Megra; Aspasia, Bellario; for the poltroon, Pharamond, is substituted the licentious tyrant of *The Maid's Tragedy*.

[2] Thorndike, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 1901, pp. 122–124.

common and are conceived on the same typical lines is not to be denied. And yet a fresh perusal of them conveys to the unbiased reader as strong an impression of the specific diversity of their personages as of their general likeness. To take Thorndike's parallel characters, Pharamond is a cowardly and ignoble voluptuary; Bessus (in *King and No King*), a mere fool and boaster; the King (of *The Maid's Tragedy*) is a voluptuary, but neither ignoble nor a fool. Megra is a spiteful and venomous trull, innately bad; Evadne, an heroic figure wrought to evil by ambition atoned in death; Arane, a queen and mother, strong to plot against one who has become unconsciously a usurper by a perpetuated wrong. As to "the lily-livered hero," Philaster is an impetuous and unreasoning prince, but he is ever the gentleman; Arbaces is a passionate man and a vulgarly boastful soldier, intentionally, on the part of the author, unprincely;[1] while bewildered and unstable Amintor is totally unlike either. Even among the love-lorn maidens, where individuality might well be wanting, Aspasia is a tragic variant of Euphrasia, but Spaconia is a young woman of resources and address, and contrives to keep her prince for herself in the end.[2]

The alleged typical personages in this group of plays.

But Thorndike not only finds the differentia already noted above distinctive of this group of the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher; he also finds like qualities in the three late plays of Shakespeare which go by the title "romances." Before we proceed to a consideration of these likenesses, let us note that the group of Shakespeare's "romances" is logically capable of considerable extension both before and after

Shakespeare's "romances."

[1] See Hazlitt, *Lectures on the Age of Elizabeth*, ed. Bohn, 113.

[2] *King and No King*, v, ii.

the years 1610 and 1611, in which these three typical plays have by some been placed. Not to press the claims of *Timon*, which comes direct from *The Palace of Pleasure*, and *Troilus*, which, however transmitted, is ultimately a medieval romance in truest sense, *Pericles* (1608) has the true atmosphere of "romance" in both the wide and the restrictive sense of that term. *Pericles* even anticipates, as has often been pointed out, situations of *The Tempest* and of *The Winter's Tale*, in the shipwreck, and in the adventures of the mother and daughter, Thaisa and Marina, Hermione and Perdita.[1] Besides, *Pericles* exhibits several spectacular features, a masque, dumb shows, a dream, derived from the pageantry of the contemporary masque and common to later plays of Shakespeare and Fletcher. On the other hand, the "romances" may quite as logically be extended to include *The Two Noble Kinsmen*. This play was first printed in 1634 as written "by the memorable worthies of their time, Mr. John Fletcher and Mr. William Shakespeare, gentlemen;" and it was included in the folio of Beaumont and Fletcher. Its authorship has been variously assigned and divided; and the weight of opinion seems to tend to allowing to Shakespeare a part in it.[2] This was the third dramatic treatment of a subject already known to English literature from Chaucer's *Knight's Tale*.[3] Outside of its Shakespearean passages or reminiscences, whichever they be, *The Two Noble Kinsmen* is not remarkable among Fletcherian plays. But whatever

*Pericles*, 1608.

*The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 1612.

[1] See above, p. 30.

[2] Lee, *Shakespeare*, 268.

[3] Edwards' *Palæmon and Arcite*, 1566; and a lost play of the same title, 1594. Cf. above, i, p. 113.

the master's share in it or influence upon it, it exhibits all the features of its kind.

If *Pericles* unites the "romance" with the tale of adventure, and *Timon* "romance" with classical story, *Cymbeline* (1609) marks a similar transition from the domain of legendary chronicle history. True, besides the British history derived from Holinshed which it contains, there is the ultimately Italian story of Iachimo's wager and Shakespeare's own invention of the stolen brothers; and if the extraordinarily crowded fifth act does revert to the "alarms and excursions" of the earlier chronicle plays, it shares likewise, in its shows and visions, the influence of the contemporary masque. Sidney Lee has pointed out the "almost ludicrous inappropriateness of the British king's courtiers" making "merry with technical terms peculiar to Calvinistic theology," an incongruity scarcely matched by the threat of Thaliard, the creature of wicked King Antiochus, who promises the death of Pericles "if I can get him within my pistol's length." [1] But these are trivial blemishes in the happy land of romance. A link with Gower's jogging octosyllables, in *Pericles*, too, is "the pitiful mummery" of the dream of Posthumus, and the lugging in of Jupiter, like Diana in the earlier play, a literal *deus ex machina*, unjustified, unnecessary, and absurd.[2] One is tempted to the surmise that, asked to furnish some such masque-like addition to his already completed play, Shakespeare refused; but asked that another might so "complete" his work, added in much the spirit of Milton's answer to Dryden on a similar oc-

*Cymbeline*, 1609.

[1] Lee's *Shakespeare*, 259; and *Cymbeline*, I, i, 136, 137, and I, ii, 30, 31; *Pericles*, I, i, 167.

[2] See *Cymbeline*, V, iv, 30–122, and *Pericles*, V, ii, 241–250.

casion, "Aye, ye may tag my verses;" and tagged they were by we know not what hopelessly prosaic hand. And yet, withal, where is there so beautiful a play as *Cymbeline?* A play of so poetic a spirit and so varied a charm? And where, outside of the tragedies, are there more consummately drawn personalities than the three main figures of this story? Iachimo, godless cynic, abashed for the moment in the presence of Imogen's peerless virtue, but perjuring his soul rather than yield to defeat in his malevolent wager; Leonatus Posthumus, true and passionate lover, honest and unimaginative man, and therefore victim to Iachimo's unimaginable villainy;[1] and sweet and womanly Imogen, loveliest of Shakespeare's heroines, breathing like a perfume through the play. I cannot subscribe for a moment to the notion that these later characters of Shakespeare display a less marked individuality than earlier ones and are reducible to the types of Fletcher,[2] granting the latter all their excellence; for Fletcher's tragicomedies are consummate pictures with the limitations of their art upon them. The personages of Shakespeare's "romances" are breathing realities instinct with light and change, and inspired with the very mobility of life.

The personages of Shakespeare's "romances" not wanting in individuality.

*The Winter's Tale*, 1611;

This quality of absolute and consummate lifelikeness is, when all has been said, the most certain of the many "notes" that distinguish Shakespeare from his fellow-dramatists. Nor is it, save in degree, less potent in the two "romances" of Shakespeare that

[1] See above, i, p. 575.

[2] Thorndike, 139; and see the dictum of Professor Wendell, *William Shakspere*, 377; who, speaking of these later "romances," says: "His faculty of creating character, as distinguished from constructing it, is gone."

follow, though in them the influence of Fletcher and the Fletcherian tragicomedy is more clearly traceable. *The Winter's Tale* was seen at the Globe by Dr. Forman in May, 1611, and was acted at court in the following November. The plot Shakespeare found all ready to his hand, as we have seen, in his old rival Greene's *Pandosto;* but Shakespeare invented the delightful Autolycus, prince of all seductive, thievish rogues, as he created the loyal and self-abnegating Paulina, a woman whose virtues of heart neither the much-enduring Hermione nor blooming Perdita parallel. Shakespeare ended his play in reconciliation, not in tragedy, as had Greene with severer logic; and it must be frankly acknowledged that therein Shakespeare bowed to the fashion of the moment, which, satiated with blood and terror, preferred and acclaimed the happy ending. Ruskin in a striking and well-known passage declares that "Shakespeare has no heroes; — he has only heroines;" and again: that "the catastrophe of every play is caused always by the folly or fault of a man; the redemption, if there be any, is by the wisdom and virtue of a woman, and, failing that, there is none." The truth of this is patent even without Ruskin's eloquent examples; but nowhere in Shakespeare are the ethical sensibilities of the modern reader so disturbed as in the forgiveness and reconciliation to his steadfast and incomparable queen of unreasoning and headstrong Leontes, jealous-mad with the foul images of his own making. In the just code of the land of romance happiness and tender mercy are not for such as Leontes; but in this imperfect world of ours we know that such precious forgiveness as that of Hermione and Imogen often

the realism of its conclusion.

[1] *Sesame and Lilies*, ed. 1876, pp. 78, 79.

waits on the unworthy, and that remorse and atonement may be not less heroic than death.

*The Tempest*, 1610–11.

Nowhere in all his works has Shakespeare so marvelously practiced the alchemy of his art as in *The Tempest*, by long-standing tradition the latest of his works. In September, 1610, news arrived in England of the shipwreck and sojourn in the island of Bermuda of Sir George Somers and the crew of his ship the Sea Venture. This news created great excitement in London because, while thus cast away among the beauties of a tropical landscape and in an island overrun by hogs (doubtless introduced by some passing ship), the superstitious seamen came to think their island haunted by strange sounds which they believed the work of invisible spirits, and named their abode The Isle of Devils. Nor was there any failure to chronicle all this in several pamphlets of the day. In *The Tempest* Shakespeare took the momentarily popular idea of a tropical island tenanted by a shipwrecked party and brought it into touch with influences supernatural. But he transformed the gross superstitions of the sailors into a tale of romantic beauty which we may verily believe his own invention, and dependent neither on the story of *Die schöne Sidea*, which it only remotely resembles, nor on some undiscovered Italian novel.[1] Like all the other Shakespearean "romances," *The Tempest* was popular from the very first. It was one of nineteen plays performed at the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth to the Elector Frederick in February, 1613, and continued to hold the stage after the Restoration, albeit degraded in the grotesque refashioning of Davenant and Dryden. With the girlish loveliness of exquisite Miranda

[1] Lee, *Shakespeare*, 262; and *Variorum Tempest*, 326 ff.

before us, and visible-invisible Ariel, now a zephyr and again a strain of heavenly music, we may borrow the eloquent plea of Horace Howard Furness for a recognition of Caliban when he asks: "Why is it that Caliban's speech is always rhythmical? There is no character in the play whose words fall at times into sweeter cadences; if the Æolian melodies of the air are sweet, the deep bass of the earth is no less rhythmically resonant;" and share in his opinion when he denies that Caliban is "utterly sensual;" and tells us: "It was by Miranda's pure loveliness and rare refinement that the soul of poetry was distilled out of that evil thing." [1]

Shakespearean "romance" not profoundly influenced by Fletcherian tragicomedy.

The mention of the likenesses between Fletcher and Shakespeare in the plays just discussed brings to mind their many divergences.[2] The Fletcherian tragicomedy of the type of *Philaster* is seated indoors, within the precincts of the court, a continuance of a long-standing preference of the romantic drama; it deals with the intrigues of love, ambition, and revenge, and habitually contrasts sentimental passion with tragic feeling and situation. The Shakespearean "romance" loves to wander over strange seas and into stranger lands; it delights in shipwreck, in adventure, in children and loved ones lost or estranged, found and reconciled; at times it trenches imaginatively upon the domain of the supernatural.[3] Once more the tragicomedies of Fletcher, and those who most

[1] *Ibid.* vi.

[2] Cf. Thorndike, 137–142, especially, and elsewhere. The main points of this theory have been sufficiently indicated above.

[3] Fletcher is of course not without examples of "romances" more or less of these classes; but the distinctive Fletcherian contribution to tragicomedy is of the Philaster type.

nearly approached him in his art, are commonly well knit and closely wrought; the characters, in their simplicity of motive, as we have seen, tending to types. While in utter contrast, the "romances" of Shakespeare are peculiarly loose in construction, recalling at times the epic quality of the old chronicle plays; and, with allowance for the nature of the material, Shakespeare's personages in these latest plays cannot be pronounced less individually distinctive, less real, or any less remote from types than the earlier creations of his genius. In a word, while the general influence of Fletcher on Shakespeare, as on others of his time, is not to be questioned, that Fletcher's new type of tragicomedy profoundly affected Shakespeare's art and produced a radical change in his methods must be emphatically denied.

The tragicomedies of Fletcher, 1613–25;

That Fletcher cultivated to the full the new type of drama first evolved by him in joint authorship with Beaumont is proved by many examples among the interesting series of dramas which continued to flow from his pen. In fully a score of plays, falling between 1612, the date of Beaumont's retirement, and that of Fletcher's death, did Fletcher continue the romantic traditions of their earlier joint authorship. While most of these productions fulfill in their romantic tone and in the seriousness of the main passions involved the conditions of tragicomedy, and while Fletcher adheres in the main to his method of contrast, his types, and his consciously mannered art, the variety of these plays is no less striking than their uniform success as acting dramas. It is notable of Fletcher's art that he refused to be bound by limitations even of his own making. Thus, his tragicomedies shade off, on the one hand, into tragedy as exemplified in *The Double Mar-*

their variety in kind and in source.

*riage*, already mentioned, or into a near approach to it in *The Captain* or in *A Wife for a Month*, in both of which examples we feel that ethics demand atonement, not compounding with sin.[1] Other plays, later called "tragicomedies," brighten into various degrees of lightness, now relieved, as to their more somber elements, by scenes of low comedy or burlesque and partaking of a livelier spirit, like *The Pilgrim*, which is almost pure comedy; or going entirely over to the comedy of manners, like *Monsieur Thomas* or *The Elder Brother*.[2] Once more, while Fletcher often preserves the indeterminateness of scene which marks the new tragicomedy as well as its contrasts and types, some of these romantic plays retain a certain local color imparted either by their realistic scenes, as in the Flemish surroundings of *Beggars' Bush*, by their retention of a faint historical flavor, or by the quality of their Spanish or other sources. More than half of these plays are based, either wholly or in part, on Spanish originals, mostly prose tales of Cervantes, Lope de Vega, de Flores, and others. Considering the intercourse, both hostile and other, between Spain and England throughout the reigns of the Tudors, it is somewhat remarkable that, save for the early *Calisto and Melibœa* and Munday's *History of Felix and Philomena*, no English play, either directly or indirectly, traceable to a Spanish source is to be found until we reach the reign of King James.[3] Nor is this

[1] Above, i, p. 601; and ii, p. 184.

[2] Cf. *The Humorous Lieutenant* or *Beggars' Bush*.

[3] Similarities to various Spanish dramas have been discovered in *Twelfth Night;* see Furness, Variorum ed. of that play, p. 377. Klein, ix, 159; *Jahrbuch*, xxxi; 414 and Bahlsen in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, vi, 154. The source of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* was doubtless the lost *Felix and Philo-*

the less noteworthy in view of the respectable list of Spanish books translated into English and published during the reigns of the children of Henry VIII.[1]

Fletcher's romantic plays from Spanish sources: Cervantes.

Turning first to the group of Fletcher's romantic plays which are certainly from Spanish sources, no less than four levy on the treasures of the *Novelas Exemplares* of Cervantes. These are the *Chances*, *The Queen of Corinth*, *The Fair Maid of the Inn*, and *Love's Pilgrimage*.[2] In point of date they scatter over Fletcher's career; in point of authorship *The Chances* is the only one in which a coadjutor has not been suspected. *The Fair Maid* is loosely constructed and of no great merit. It was licensed in January, 1626, and was therefore acted after Fletcher's death. Its source is *La Ilustre Fregona*, which is followed only as to the main plot and not very closely. *Love's Pilgrimage* is a very pleasant and sprightly comedy containing only a tinge of more serious material. It is founded on *Las Dos Doncellas*, one of the best of the

*mena*, just mentioned in the text. Its source is the *Diana* of Montemayor, its date 1585.

[1] J. G. Underhill, *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors*, 1899, pp. 375–407, where a list of some hundred and sixty titles of books translated from the Spanish appears.

[2] To this list of plays derived from the *Novelas Exemplares* may be added *A Very Woman* from *El Amante Liberal* by Massinger, perhaps assisted by Fletcher; the comedy of manners, *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife;* touches in *Beggars' Bush* from *La Gitanilla;* and perhaps *The Coxcomb* from *El Curioso Impertinente*, first published in *Don Quixote*, and later as one of the *Novelas*. In addition to the usual sources of information, especially Koeppel, and J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly in his *Translation of Cervantes*, 1902, i, p. xxxvi, and his *Cervantes in England*, 1905, I am indebted, in these paragraphs concerning Spanish sources in Fletcher's plays, to the unpublished researches on this topic of my friend and late student, Dr. A. S. W. Rosenbach.

*Novelas Exemplares*, which it follows with fidelity and success. The certainty of this source destroys the idea that this play was first acted as early as 1613, and with it the notion that it is capable of identification with *Cardenio*, registered as Shakespeare's and Fletcher's in 1653.[1] Both *The Fair Maid of the Inn* and *Love's Pilgrimage* seem to have suffered a late revision in which Massinger, with the help of William Rowley and of Jonson respectively, has been traced.[2]

*The Chances*, 1615.

In *The Chances*, certainly acted by 1615, is told the accidents, or "chances," by which two young students unexpectedly become the protectors of a lady and her child. The solution is complicated by the confusion of the Lady Constantia with a woman of the same name who has run away from her lover with a musician on the very same night. In this delightful play, Fletcher follows his original, *La Señora Cornelia*, with singular fidelity, catching not only the spirit, but the very atmosphere of his source. In *The Chances* we may perceive what adaptations a Spanish story, told with that masterly brevity and fidelity to essentials alone which distinguishes Cervantes at his best, demanded before it could be made acceptable to the London stage. Fletcher has substituted for the dry humor of Spain the coarser and more boisterous humor of England; and he has added several minor personages and details of plot. The free and outspoken characters of the two young friends, with the humors of Mistress Gillian, their landlady, kept *The Chances* long popular on the stage.

[1] Hazlitt, *Manual*, 143; Fleay, i, 193. See Fitzmaurice-Kelly's refutation of Fleay's ideas in Shelton's *Don Quixote, Tudor Translations*, 1896, i, pp. xlvii–l.

[2] Oliphant, xv, 346.

Cervantes employed by Fletcher in translation.

*The Custom of the Country*, in which Massinger may have had a hand, was an "old play in 1628." Here Cervantes is once more laid under contribution. But this time the source is found in the *roman d'aventure*, *Historia de los trabajos de Persiles y Sigismunda*, the last work to come from the great Spaniard's hand and one completed in 1616, the very year of his death.[1] *The Custom of the Country* is one of the coarsest and foulest plays of its time, though this quality is not to be laid to the example of Cervantes. It is worthy of note here that the *Novelas* of Cervantes had been translated into French by de Rosset and d'Audiguier in 1615, as *Don Quixote* had been translated into English by Shelton in 1612. In 1618 d'Audiguier also translated *Persiles y Sigismunda;* and in 1619 this last was "made English" under the title *The Travailes of Persiles and Sigismunda* by Matthew Lownes.[2] No other work of Cervantes besides these was employed as a source by Fletcher, although the *comedias* and *entremeses* of Cervantes enjoyed a considerable popularity in the Peninsula. The inference seems plain. Fletcher read Cervantes only in translation.

*The Pilgrim*, 1621, derived from a French translation of Lope.

For *The Pilgrim*, Fletcher turned to the popular prose romance of Lope de Vega, *El Peregrino en su Patria*, which had already been translated from a French version into English as *The Pilgrim of Castile* in 1621.[3] The drama was acted within the same year

[1] The play is described as a mosaic made out of episodes of the Spanish romance. See Koeppel, i, 65. The underplot lays the *Hecatommithi* under contribution.

[2] Arber, *Stationers' Register*, iii, 642.

[3] Koeppel, i, 100–103. Dr. Rosenbach first noted the English source of this play, referring to the *Stationers' Register*, Arber, iv, 21.

and thus offers an interesting example of the readiness of the dramatists to utilize popular contemporary material. This story of a lover who returns in the disguise of a beggar to his native place to seek the lady of his love is one of the cleanest, lightest, and most charming of later comedies. Somewhat old-fashioned, too, it is in its outlaws of the forest, its wanderings and disguises, its merry soubrette, Julietta, and its use of the humors of mad folk. Rosenbach remarks a likeness in temperament between Fletcher and Lope, and finds this illustrated especially in their "love of intrigue, of imbroglio, of disguisings, of successful love-making;" to which he might well have added their tireless inventiveness and facile ability to turn any material into acceptable drama. As no other recourse of Fletcher to Lope de Vega for the subject of a play has as yet been recorded, the inference is once more plain : Fletcher utilized the only production of Lope which had been translated into a language accessible to him.

*Women Pleased*, 1620.

Another Spanish prose tale dramatized, at least so far as the main plot is concerned, is *Women Pleased*, a drama of diversified interest ultimately referable to the *Historia de Aurelio y Isabella* by Juan de Flores. Here, however, as elsewhere, Fletcher's immediate source must have been a French or English version of this exceedingly popular tale.[1] *Women Pleased* is an excellent example of Fletcher's composite art, whereby tragicomedy and a variety of the comedy of manners, trespassing on absolute farce, are not unhappily welded together into an entertainment which

[1] Koeppel, i, 87; and see Underhill, *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors*, 305, note, where anonymous English versions of this story dating 1556, 1586, and 1588 are mentioned.

could not but have been very effective in the hands of a skillful troupe. In his sources Fletcher is equally composite, compiling his underplot from no less than three Italian *novelle*, if he did not borrow some of his material, as seems more likely, from earlier English plays.

*The Spanish Curate* and *The Maid in the Mill*, 1622–23.

Fletcher derived two plays from the *Poema Tragico del Español Gerardo* by Gonzalo de Cespedes, as Englished in 1622, under the title of *Gerardo the Unfortunate Spaniard*, by Leonard Digges, who is now solely remembered for a few lines prefixed to the first folio of Shakespeare.[1] These plays are *The Spanish Curate*, licensed in October, 1622, a brilliant and forcible play, which held the stage long after the Restoration; and *The Maid in the Mill*, licensed in August of the following year, and comparatively a slight if clever enough performance. Massinger has been discovered in the more serious parts of the former play; and the comedy scenes, which are Fletcher's own, have received deserved praise.[2] The latter play is little bettered by the alleged help of William Rowley, and is a skillful fabric of the Spanish story interwoven with material derived from Bandello.[3] A likeness which Koeppel discovered between *The Maid* and the *Entremes del Robo de Helena* (printed in 1644) seems referable to their common source in the *Poema Tragico*.[4] Rosenbach comments on "the marked resemblance of that part of the play dealing with the miller and his fair daughter, which Fletcher

[1] Dyce, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed. 1854, ii, 442, 548.

[2] Ward, ii, 723.

[3] Koeppel, i, 112, where other points of contact with earlier literature are suggested.

[4] The opinion of Dr. Rosenbach.

borrowed from Bandello, to a play by Lope de Vega, *La Quinta de Florencia*."

*The Island Princess*, 1621.

More questionable as to its precise source is the quasi-historical *Island Princess*, acted in 1621, and usually accepted as Fletcher's unaided work. This interesting and effective tragicomedy is derived from a story which has been found by various editors in a Spanish play published years after Fletcher's in a French narrative by Bellan, appended to a translation of the novels of Cervantes, and lastly in a rare Spanish work by Bartolome Leonardo de Argensola, called *Conquista de las Islas Malucas*, Madrid, 1609.[1] Stiefel, who discovered this last, makes his point, that the author of *The Island Princess* commonly expresses himself in terms closer to the Spanish than to the French version; and thus in this we have the only play of Fletcher's of Spanish origin for which no translation into French or English has been discovered. Rosenbach is none the less loath to accept this as proof positive that Fletcher went direct to a Spanish source. He argues the popularity of books of this class, among them many that were translated from the Spanish, and asks us to accept the possibility of a lost English translation of de Argensola's book. As an alternative, he doubts that the play is wholly Fletcher's, and, suggesting Massinger, reminds us that that poet was indubitably acquainted with the Castilian tongue.[2] As to the play itself, it tells the story of the offer of Quisara, Princess of Tidore, to marry the man who should redeem her brother from

[1] Weber first suggested a source in 1812. Dyce found the French version which Koeppel, i, 98–100, accepted; but see Stiefel, "Ueber die Quelle von J. Fletcher's Island Princess," *Archiv*, ciii, 277.

[2] *Rosenbach MS.* under *The Island Princess*.

captivity in the neighboring island of Ternata. The Princess' hopes lay in Ruy Dias, whom she loved; but he proving dilatory, another young Portuguese nobleman, Armusia, accomplished the deed with great bravery and claimed the offered reward. The Princess, reluctant to marry against her inclinations, is at last won by the steadfastness of Armusia, who has fallen a victim to a plot against him on account of his Christianity. In the end the Portuguese garrison rescues the now united pair.[1]

Other Fletcherian plays of Spanish source.

Were our search for Spanish influences in the plays associated with the name of Fletcher pressed further, we might add the interesting lost *History of Cardenio*, acted twice in 1613 before the king, and registered, in 1653, as by Fletcher and Shakespeare.[2] This play, whether Shakespeare had hand in it or not, was almost certainly modeled on the amorous adventures of Cardenio as told in Thomas Shelton's translation of *Don Quixote*, 1612.[3] In 1727 Lewis Theobald, the Shakespeare critic, published a play which he called *The Double Falsehood or the Discreet Lovers*, and which he professed to have based on an unfinished draft of Shakespeare's.[4] This production deals

[1] *The Conquest of the West Indies*, mentioned in 1601, must have presented very different material. See Henslowe, 135, and elsewhere.

[2] *New Shakspere Society's Transactions*, 1895–96, Part II, 419. *Cardenio* was registered by Humphrey Moseley, notorious for his inaccuracies. The title appears variously as *Cardenno* and *Cardenna*.

[3] Chapters xxiii–xxxvii; and see above, pp. 190, 207.

[4] "There is a tradition," says Theobald, "which I have from a noble person who supplied me with one of my copies, that it was given by our author, as a present of value, to a natural daughter of his, for whose sake he wrote it in the time of his retirement from the stage." Quoted in Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, ii, 413.

with the story of Cardenio, but we may agree with Lee that "Theobald doubtless took advantage of a tradition that Shakespeare and Fletcher had combined to dramatize the Cervantic theme."[1] Further in search for Spanish influences on Fletcher, we might add *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, and *The Little French Lawyer* (both of them comedies of manners), to the list of such derivatives; as the first obtained its underplot from *El Casamiento Engañoso*, the eleventh of the *Novelas Exemplares*, and, as Langbaine long ago suggested, *The Little French Lawyer* derives its main plot from an episode of the famous picaresque romance, *Guzman de Alfarache* by Mateo Aleman.[2] We might likewise recur to the unquestionable influence of *Don Quixote* on the plan and conduct of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, and recall how an episode of *The Double Marriage* reminds one critic of a similar episode in the same immortal romance, while another critic finds a personage of *The Prophetess* clearly modeled on the adventures of Sancho Panza as governor of Barataria.[3]

There remains one play commonly attributed to Beaumont and Fletcher which is distinguishable from all others because of its derivation direct from a Spanish drama, whereas all the rest come from Spanish romances: and for the most part, as we have seen, from translated romances, too, at that.

[1] Lee, *Shakespeare*, 267.

[2] See L. Bahlsen, *Eine Komödie Fletcher's*, Berlin, 1894; and see Langbaine, 210. Koeppel, i, 60, notes that this story might have been found in Massuccio di Salerno. As to both these comedies, see below, pp. 247, 248.

[3] See above, i, pp. 206–208, as to *The Knight of the Burning Pestle;* and Koeppel, i, 82 and 105, quoting M. Rapp, *Studien über das englische Theater*, Tübingen, 1862.

*Love's Cure or the Martial Maid*, c. 1626, not Fletcher's.

Although this play is not strictly a tragicomedy, it is obvious that it is most properly treated in this place. *Love's Cure or the Martial Maid* was first printed in the folio of Beaumont and Fletcher in 1647, and has been variously regarded as an early production of Beaumont's rewritten by Massinger, as Fletcher's revised by Massinger, or as Massinger's alone.[1] The story of *Love's Cure* turns on the bold idea of a girl reared in the camp and inured to martial deeds, and a boy, her brother, contrastedly housed and effeminated. In both the power of love works a regeneration to the more appropriate temper of each sex. It now appears that this striking plot is an adaptation of the *Comedia de la Fuerza de la Costumbre* by Guillen de Castro, a production licensed for print at Valencia, February 7, 1625, and published about three months later. We may allow, with Stiefel, some eight weeks for the arrival of a copy of this play in London. This would make it, say, July. Now as Fletcher died in August of this year, had he a hand in *Love's Cure* it must have been written within the period of one month. Stiefel accepts this with its corollaries, that Fletcher read Spanish, and that this was the latest of his works.[2] Rosenbach, on the contrary, combats this view, calling attention to the fact that *Love's Cure* exhibits a closer familiarity with the Spanish tongue and a more frequent and natural employment of Spanish words than are to be found in any other play of the Beaumont and Fletcher folio. Besides this, he finds the blank verse of this comedy totally unlike Fletcher's, as is the author's free method in

[1] Oliphant, xiv, 79; Fleay, i, 180; Bullen, under Fletcher, *Dictionary of National Biography*.

[2] Stiefel, "Die Nachamung spanischer Komödien in England," *Archiv*, xcix, 271.

treating his borrowed plot. On the strength of these premises, together with the likeness of the verse to Massinger's and the similarity of certain characters of that poet to characters in *Love's Cure*, Rosenbach accepts Bullen's ascription of the play to Massinger, and denies Fletcher even the slightest part in it.[1]

Summary of Spanish influence on "Beaumont and Fletcher."

In summary, then, of Spanish influence on plays commonly known as those of Beaumont and Fletcher, we may record that seventeen of the fifty-two commonly attributed to these authors show traces in their plots of Spanish sources. As eighteen others remain as yet undetermined as to origin, we may accept the claim of Rosenbach that a third of these plays refer back to the literature of Castile, or a half of those the sources of which are known. The degree of this indebtedness varies from an entire plot, as in *The Chances* or *The Pilgrim*, to a suggestion of plan, as in *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, or the borrowing of a personage or episode, as in *The Prophetess* or *The Little French Lawyer*. Once more, only seven Spanish authors have been levied on for these seventeen plays, Cervantes contributing to nine English plays, only one other author, Cespedes, to more than one. All of Fletcher's Spanish material is derived from the prose romances of the Castilian tongue, as *Love's Cure*, which is derived from a Spanish play, is not Fletcher's. In consequence, there seems no reason to assume that Fletcher went to the original Spanish for any one of his plays, unless we except *The Island Princess*, for the immediate source of which it seems not impossible that an English translation of the *Conquista de las Islas Malucas* may once have existed. Again, but three of these seven-

[1] *Rosenbach MS.* under *Love's Cure.*

teen plays of Spanish source are now assigned in any part to Beaumont; hence the credit of first using Spanish material as a source for English drama must be assigned to Fletcher, with perhaps a doubt as to the part which Fletcher's friend and collaborator, Massinger, may have taken in this broaching of a new source. Lastly, save for a few plays of earlier date, the period of Spanish influence on Fletcher lies between 1618 and 1625; for of the twenty-five plays in which that author figured within that period (a period which coincides with the greatest activity of English translation from Spanish prose), fourteen of Fletcher's plays exhibit Spanish origins. The remarkable thing is that the great contemporary drama of Lope de Vega seems not to have touched the dramatists of the age of King James, notwithstanding that the first volume of the comedies of Lope (albeit issued without the consent of the author) was in print as early as 1604. Indubitably Fletcher learned more from Spain than these identified sources indicate; for much of the spirit of the *comedias de capa y espada* is preserved in his work, while his dependence on plot and the original turn thereof, the minor importance which he attaches to character, with the types which resulted therefrom, mark others of the many interesting parallels between Fletcherian tragicomedy and the drama of Spain.

Middleton and Rowley's *Spanish Gipsy*, 1623.

It is matter of wonder that the way to the riches of Castilian literature thus once shown, there should have been so few to follow Fletcher's example. Among the plays of an historical cast which deal with the history of Spain, we found none derivable directly from Spanish sources.[1] The best of these plays is

[1] See above, i, pp. 429–434.

Rowley's *All's Lost by Lust*, and an English intermediary doubtless existed for it. On the other hand, Rowley's collaboration with Fletcher in *The Maid in the Mill*, though the subject here, too, was derived through translation,[1] suggests an interest in Spanish topics awakened by this collaboration, and makes clear that Rowley, and not Middleton, inspired the selection of subject for their joint production, *The Spanish Gipsy*.[2] This fine and effective drama combines two stories of Cervantes,[3] one a somber one of the wrong done a pure maiden, the remorse of her assailant, and the strange circumstances by which they are brought to marriage and the wrong redressed; the other a typical tale of a noble gentleman, Alvarez, outlawed and living disguised among gipsies, with the humors of their free life and the romantic attachments which the pretty gipsy maiden, Pretiosa, — really the daughter of Alvarez, — inspires in certain young gallants of the town of "Madrill." *The Spanish Gipsy* is a tragicomedy of power and ably written. Its all but tragic main plot and the romantic spirit which pervades much of it take this play out of the category of the comedy of manners and into that of the tragicomedy of Fletcherian type.[4] The Stuart drama exhibits no other example of an equally successful following of the lead of Fletcher in drama derived from the literature of Spain until we come to the work of Massinger. It can scarcely be a coincidence that *The*

[1] See above, pp. 210, 211.

[2] *The Maid* was licensed in August, 1623. *The Spanish Gipsy* was acted by the Lady Elizabeth's players at the Cockpit and at Whitehall in November of the same year. Fleay, ii, 101.

[3] *La Fuerza de la Sangre* and *La Gitanilla*.

[4] Cf. below, p. 236.

*Spanish Gipsy* and Middleton's *More Dissemblers Besides Women*, a comedy in which a tribe of gipsies figures as well, should date 1622 and 1623, or that both plays should have followed so hard on Jonson's successful masque, *The Gipsies Metamorphosed*, presented before the king in August, 1621.

Other tragi-comedies of Fletcher; *The Mad Lover*, 1619;

To return to Fletcher, the remainder of the tragi-comedies in which his hand appears are based either upon sources more usual in the earlier drama, are original, or at least more composite in their employment of material. *The Mad Lover*, 1619, with all its merits of conduct and brilliancy of diction, has been justly described as "romantic comedy run to riot." [1] It is regrettable that the lunatic lover, Memnon (an elderly man too, at that), with his absurd delusion that he must offer up his heart literally to be held in his mistress' hand, has not yet been found among the puerilities of medieval fable. Bandello contributes the licentious anecdote of priestly subornation on which the underplot of *The Mad Lover* is founded.[2] The scene is appropriately Paphos. Vastly in contrast with such strained ingenuity and full of novel adventure is *The Sea Voyage*, licensed in 1622. Here the story turns upon castaways and shipwreck; and the various humors of a ship's company in terror from storm, quarreling over discovered treasure and near the extremity of starvation, are dramatized with much vigor. The fancy of a company of women, self-sufficient and ruling, and defying man is an old one; it is here

*The Sea Voyage*, 1622;

[1] Ward, ii, 701. Dr. O. L. Hatcher, in her suggestive monograph, *John Fletcher*, 1906, p. 44, regards this play as "typical of Fletcher's handling of Italian material."

[2] Bandello, iii, 19; also in Josephus, and mentioned by Langbaine.

worked out with considerable humor and not without Fletcherian advantage taken of its objectionable possibilities.[1] *Beggars' Bush*, acted in the same year, brings the scene to Flanders, and combines with a story of a banished noble family, variously disguised among common folk to escape the machinations of a usurper against their lives, a series of pleasant realistic scenes of the humors of professional vagrants which were sketched from still nearer home.[2] *Beggars' Bush* is an engaging and effective play. The glorification of the merchant in whose disguise the young prince, Florez, masquerades is reminiscent of the older bourgeois comedy of London life, and a parallel in the situation of Florez, awaiting his ships which are rumored to have miscarried, and Antonio, the merchant of Venice, has not escaped comment.[3] No play of Fletcher's presents so forbidding a subject as *A Wife for a Month*, which lays its scene in Naples in the reign of Frederick, a typical lustful and cruel Fletcherian tyrant. His unspeakable practices on the virtuous steadfastness of two faithful lovers, with his own overthrow by the return of his honorable elder brother, form a drama not without effect, albeit the play concludes in contrition and forgiveness after the sinewless method of tragicomedy when human nature cries out for redemption in blood.[4]

*Beggar's Bush*, 1622;

*A Wife for a Month*, 1624.

[1] For several literary parallels, see Ward, ii, 728; to these might be added *The Lady Errant* of William Cartwright, 1635, a witty and facile comedy, and Mayne's *Amorous War*, 1639.

[2] Oliphant is of the opinion that *Beggars' Bush* was originally written by Beaumont and revised by Fletcher and Massinger, *Englische Studien*, xv, 356.

[3] Koeppel, i, 109; M. Rapp, *Studien über das englische Theater*, 67.

[4] Langbaine, 216, mentions a resemblance between the story

Shakespearean reminiscence in Fletcher.

That the later drama, Fletcher with the rest, is full of reminiscence of plays of the past is not for a moment to be denied. We have noted a suggestion of *The Merchant of Venice* in *Beggars' Bush;* and the likeness of *The Sea Voyage* to *The Tempest*, though superficial, is patent to the casual reader. Koeppel finds a similarity to a "motive" of *As You Like It* in *The Mad Lover;* and an examination of his index discloses a list of twenty-three plays of Shakespeare, some of them furnishing, like *Hamlet*, nearly a dozen "likenesses" in motive, personage, or word to plays of the time mostly Fletcher's.[1] With due respect for the industrious and fruitful scholarship of one to whom this subject owes much, may it not be surmised that, despite their proximity, the minds of Shakespeare's great contemporaries fell really less into the powerful orbit of his compelling influence than do we, the critics of modern times, who too often, like powerless and broken asteroids, revolve in never-ending circles about the blinding sun of his genius?

Typical later tragicomedies of Fletcher:

Two tragicomedies have been reserved for somewhat fuller consideration as peculiarly typical of Fletcher's confirmed and matured manner. In the first, *The Knight of Malta*, acted in 1619, Fletcher has submitted an older play, not impossibly Beaumont's, to a complete revision. The second, *The Loyal Subject*, of nearly the same date, is one of the few plays which the critical dagger of Aristarchus has left to Fletcher's sole and unaided authorship. In the

of this play and the history of Sancho VIII, King of Leon; but Koeppel, i, 114, says this remains to be proved, and notes a parallel between the character Valerio and Amintor of *The Maid's Tragedy*, and between Evanthe and Ordella in *Thierry and Theodoret*.

[1] *Ibid.* 78, 156.

former play Mountferrat, a brave knight of Malta, is afflicted with a mad passion to possess Oriana, sister of Valetta, the grand master of his order. She has repulsed his advances, but concealed them out of regard to the honor of the order. Goaded to madness, Mountferrat engages Oriana's Moorish waiting-woman, Zanthia, to forge in her lady's hand a letter, traitorously giving over Malta to one of its enemies. The plot succeeds. Oriana is to be cleared by trial by combat, and Gomera, a Spanish gentleman, novice of the order, though also a suitor for the hand of Oriana, throws down his gage to Mountferrat. Meantime Miranda, an Italian gentleman, also a novice and a suitor for Oriana's hand, has helped defeat the Turks off Malta. Hearing from Mountferrat of the impending duel, after first defying the traducer, Miranda begs to be permitted to fight in Mountferrat's place, a boon readily granted by the recreant knight. Meeting Gomera, Miranda, the lady's champion, is conquered, as he had planned, and the honor of his beloved lady is thus saved. This would have been enough for an older play, but here the story continues. Gomera marries the Lady Oriana at her brother's behest, and is worked to a groundless jealousy of her affection for Miranda. The Moor gives Oriana a sleeping potion; thought dead, she is conveyed to the tomb; she awakes, like Juliet, in the tomb, which is visited severally by Mountferrat, Gomera, and Miranda at cross-purposes, and the last bears off the lady and restores her to health. Omitting other complications, of which there are several, the chief motive of the latter half of the play is the temptation of Miranda, and his (Fletcherian) victory, and final taking of the holy vows at the moment

*The Knight of Malta*, 1619; the ideal of knighthood.

when the recreant knight, Mountferrat, is degraded from the order. The possibilities of this plot are great, and some of them are surprisingly well employed. The character of Mountferrat, his remorse, his struggle against his nobler self, and his ignoble end are powerfully conceived. The chivalrous relations, too, of Gomera and Miranda, together with the struggle of each between an earthly love and the nobler honors which the holy brotherhood in arms holds out to them, are nobly and restrainedly suggested. Moreover, Fletcher has spoiled the character Oriana less than might have been expected from other examples of Fletcherian pure women. And not only have we one of the most engaging of all the bluff and hearty soldiers of this poet in Norandine, the Danish sailor, but the Moor Zanthia, who is the mainspring of the action, is natural with all her wickedness, and admirable in her unrepentant devotion to the man she has ruined.

The moral taint of Fletcher.

Ward praises "the greatest scene in this play, where Oriana's eloquence directs the thoughts of the youthful knight Miranda from a less pure passion [really a love for another man's wife] to a spiritual love," and remembers "no nobler vindication of the authority of moral law in the whole range of the Elizabethan drama." [1] But to justify all this praise, at least as to Miranda, we must omit to read several passages.[2] In very fact this admirable drama is sorely touched with the dangerous taint that mars nearly every play in which Fletcher had a hand. Miranda, disinterested in friendship, ideal in his love, and uplifted by spiritual yearnings, is presented in two scenes of struggle and temptation which would have been

[1] Ward, ii, 689.

[2] v, i, from "Yet will I try her to the very blade."

impossible, as Fletcher conducts them, to any pure-minded man, but from which Fletcher would have us believe that Miranda emerged morally clean.[1] That virtue tried is virtue proved is patent and obvious; but that virtue put to the test by simulated depravity is the clearer, that innocency is true innocency only when it has gathered to its breast all the wisdom and much of the experience of the serpent — these things are subtleties in casuistical immorality, outfathoming the lowest depths of the Restoration stage. How infinitely more noble, for example, is the fall of Richard Feverel with the anguish and the pity of it all than the unclean chastity and the prurient triumphs over the flesh of these Fletcherian heroes.

*The Loyal Subject, c.* 1618; its theme the test of loyalty.

In *The Loyal Subject* the plot turns on a test of loyalty under extraordinarily wanton royal infliction. This is a favorite Fletcherian situation, and one which we have met in its more natural tragic form in *The Maid's Tragedy* and in *Valentinian*. It will be remembered that the unhappy Amintor in the former tragedy is chosen by his tyrant master to be the stale or stalking horse of the royal amours with Evadne, who is married to Amintor with that design. *Valentinian* offers a closer parallel, for there the brave old general, Aëcius, abused, degraded, assassins sent to kill him, falls on his own sword rather than prove traitor to his tormentor, who is also his emperor. Similarly in *The Loyal Subject*, an honorable old warrior who has proved the bulwark of the state is slighted by his young master in test of his subject's loyalty. The original of this story, from which Fletcher's play differs materially, is to be found in the tale of Artaxerxes and his seneschal, Ariobarzanes, told in

[1] III, iv; and v, i.

Heywood's treatment of the same theme.

Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* and derived thence from Bandello.[1] This story was perhaps first dramatized in *Marshal Osric*, a lost production by Heywood and Smith bearing date 1597.[2] It was revised and rewritten in the version which we have by the former dramatist, about 1618, as *The Royal King and Loyal Subject*, and doubtless in consequence of Fletcher's play. Heywood's play transfers the story from Persia to England in the reign of an indeterminate king, converts the seneschal into a marshal, and follows the original tale with closeness. Here the story is a contest in courtesy wherein the subject dares to vie with his sovereign in princely gifts and favors. The King, to test his servant's loyalty, orders him to yield all his honors to his chief enemy, which the Marshal does without murmur, and retires to his estate. The King now demands that the Marshal send the fairer of his two daughters to court. He sends the less fair, and the King marrying her, the Marshal in return of courtesy bestows a double dowry on her. Months later the Queen declares (as her father had bade her) that her sister is fairer than herself, whereupon her lord sends her home to her father (an outcome foreseen), bidding him send the younger daughter. This in due time he does, sending with her the Queen, now restored to health, and with her, her infant son, the King's heir.

[1] *Palace of Pleasure*, ed. Jacobs, 1890, ii, 176; Koeppel, i, 133, was the first to point this out.

[2] Henslowe, 51; and 181 and 184 under date 1602, when the play was apparently revised for the first time. Cf. above, i, p. 304. But see the recent edition of this play by Dr. Kate W. Tibbals, *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, 1906, p. 8, for a different conclusion as to the identity of this play with *Marshal Osric*. See, also, Miss Tibbals' comparison of this play with *Chabot*, *ibid.* 35–37.

The King then bestows the hand of the Marshal's younger daughter on his eldest son and heir, and gives the Princess, his sister, in marriage to the Marshal, who returns her dowry that he may not feel an inferiority to his wife. At this the King, losing all patience to be thus ever surpassed, orders the Marshal tried, and he is convicted of treason. As his head lies on the block, this persistent if magnanimous sovereign completes the contest of favors by royally granting the loyal subject his life and the return of all his honors.[1] Fletcher's changes in this story are characteristic. The scene is transferred to Muscovy, the test of the subject's loyalty becomes analogous to the eternal trial of woman's chastity, and the loyal subject, a species of Patient Grissel in armor, less courteous than absurdly long-suffering. He is maligned and traduced and even physically tortured, and when his son and the soldiers, who love their old general, rebel to save him, his loyalty extends to an eager endeavor to disown his own son as a traitor. As to the fair daughters, so fresh and maidenly in old Heywood, they are here represented as sent to court together and succeeding — at least the elder — by sheer effrontery in getting the Duke for a husband instead of a lover. This unmaidenly maiden, introduced to the Duke's presence, hardly utters a dozen words before she is prating of the betrayal of innocence and of the futility of such conquests to great men. Dared, she kisses the

Fletcher's changes in the story;

heroic loyalty;

"unmaidenly modesty."

[1] It is interesting to find Heywood returning at the very end of his career to this idea of a contest and test in courtesy in the underplot of *A Challenge for Beauty*, 1635. Here the contest, which is between a Spanish and an English sea-captain, is carried to a degree of extraordinary inventiveness and improbability. Cf. below, pp. 309, 310.

Duke again and again, and bids her sister also "hug him softly." Nor does she hesitate to tell him:

> "Were I fit to be your wife (so much I honor ye),
> Trust me I would scratch for ye but I would have ye,
> I would woo ye then."[1]

*The Laws of Candy*, c. 1619.

With *The Laws of Candy* and *The Lovers' Progress* we complete our survey of Fletcherian tragicomedy. The former play, as we have it, has certainly been submitted to a thorough rewriting by some hand other than Fletcher. But whether this is an early play of Beaumont's and Fletcher's, revised by Massinger, or "almost entirely Massinger's," is a matter which must remain beyond determination.[2] The plot involves a contest for military honors between a father, Cassilane, and his son, Antinous, both of whom have nobly served the state of Candia. The son is publicly adjudged the nobler, and his father, in anger and mortification, disowns him. On the other hand, the beautiful and imperious Princess Erato, whom the Prince of Cyprus is courting, is taken with the heroic character of young Antinous, who is too preoccupied with his sorrows to care for her. He accepts, however, the proffer of her love, and by that means his father's poverty is relieved, a plot upon the state discovered, and a reconciliation effected. In the end the Princess, with a return of her native pride, bestows her hand on her faithful lover, the Prince of Cyprus. The regeneration which love, her charitable acts, and the

[1] Act IV, sc. i. See, however, Ward's amazing encomium of "the self-possessed purity" and "girlish innocence" of this pair, ii, 701.

[2] Oliphant places this play as early as 1604, Fleay in 1619. The latter critic's notion that the play is Massinger's because the plot contains a contention between a father and a son, very dissimilar, be it observed, to that of *The Unnatural Combat*, seems fanciful.

indifference of Antinous works in the Princess is admirably represented. Nor do the laws concerning the reward of him who is best approved and the punishment of those convicted of ingratitude, though made the chief motives, interfere with the naturalness of the plot. It seems impossible to subscribe to the low estimate usually put upon this ingenious and effective play.[1]

*The Lovers' Progress*, 1623.

Vastly in contrast is *The Lovers' Progress*, probably first written by Fletcher about 1623 and later revised by Massinger or perhaps Shirley. Derived from an all but contemporary piece of French prose fiction, *The Lovers' Progress* has been with reason identified with a play entitled *The Wandering Lovers*, registered as Massinger's in 1653, a title derived from the underplot of the play.[2] The chief topic is the fervent but honorable devotion of Lysander, a French gentleman, to Calista, the wife of his friend, the compromising situation into which they are innocently thrown by the false witness of a discarded waiting-woman on the murder of Calista's husband, and their final vindication. There is an atmosphere of old-time courtesy and all but heroic disinterestedness about several of the personages of this well-planned and admirably written play that makes it one of the most attractive of its time.

Philip Massinger, 1584–1640.

The name of Philip Massinger has appeared again and again in the foregoing pages, as we have traced his part in tragedy, in domestic, romantic, and classical subjects.[3] We have likewise found the name

[1] Ward, ii, 723.

[2] Cf. *Lisandre et Calista*, by M. d'Audiguier, Paris, 1615. *The Wandering Lovers* was licensed December 6, 1623.

[3] Above, i, pp. 430–432, 440, 445, 553, 603–605; ii, 39–43.

of Massinger associated in the preceding paragraphs of this chapter with that of Fletcher in nearly a dozen dramas specifically of the class of tragicomedy. The few facts known of Massinger's life disclose that he was born at Salisbury, the son of Arthur Massinger, gentleman, a member of Parliament and trusted in the service of Henry, the second Earl of Pembroke. The dramatist was baptized November 24, 1584, and was entered at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, in 1602, which he quitted without a degree four years later, perhaps because of his father's death. When Massinger began as playwright we do not know. We hear of him first in this capacity in a letter addressed by him, together with Field and Daborne, to Henslowe, beseeching the loan of five pounds, on the security of a promised play, to bail the petitioners out of prison.[1] This letter is supposed to have been written about 1613 or 1614. A bond binding Massinger and Daborne to pay "Henslowe three pounds of lawful money of England," bearing date July 4, 1615, is likewise extant.[2] The inference is plain: Massinger began his career in the hard school of Henslowe. The association of Massinger with Fletcher appears to have begun about 1613 or perhaps a trifle earlier.[3] The two remained close friends to the end; and Massinger, surviving until 1640, was buried, according to Cockayne, in St. Saviour's in the same grave with Fletcher.[4] Some of the earlier plays of

[1] Malone's *Shakespeare*, iii, 337.

[2] *Memoirs of Alleyn*, p. 121.

[3] Fleay finds Massinger in *The Honest Man's Fortune* mentioned by Henslowe under that year.

[4] See the several mentions of Massinger in *Small Poems of Divers Sorts*, 1658, by Sir Aston Cockayne, his warm personal friend; and Ward, iii, 5 n.

Massinger's independent composition were written for the Queen's company; but most of his collaboration with Fletcher, and all of his work subsequent to Fletcher's death, in 1625, was for the King's players, which continued to the closing of the theaters the leading troupe of actors.

Massinger in collaboration.

Massinger's name has been associated with no less than fifty-four plays, ranging from 1613 to 1639, the year preceding his death. Besides Fletcher, Daborne and Field certainly collaborated with him, the former in work, so far as we know, now lost, Field especially in the strong domestic tragedy, *The Fatal Dowry*, 1619. *The Virgin Martyr* and the one or two non-extant plays in which Massinger's name appears with Dekker's (all about 1620) seem to have been old productions of Dekker's revised by the younger playwright,[1] who is supposed earlier, in 1615, to have revised *The Old Law* of Middleton and Rowley, as he is surmised by some to have been concerned alike in *Henry VIII* and *The Two Noble Kinsmen* as early as 1611.[2] The several effective comedies of manners which Massinger contributed to the stage of his day will claim our later attention.[3] We are here concerned with the tragicomedies in which, with unaided hand, Massinger carried forward the traditions which Beaumont and Fletcher had established, and which he had already had, in collaboration, so strong an influence in perpetuating.

[1] The other two are *Philenzo and Hippolito*, identified by Fleay with Henslowe's *Philippo and Hippolita*, 1594, and *Antonio and Vallia*, revised in the next year. Both were destroyed by Warburton's cook.

[2] Fleay, ii, 100; i, 189–192, and his *Life of Shakespeare*, 251; Lee, *Shakespeare*, 268–272.

[3] Below, pp. 253–256.

The tragicomedies of Massinger.

Seven plays constitute the group of Massinger's tragicomedies; and three of them were certainly written during the latter years of the reign of King James and while Massinger was still in active collaboration with his friend Fletcher.[1] Of these three, one, *The Bondman*, has already claimed our attention from the basis of its plot in classical story; although its treatment is purely that of tragicomic romance.[2] In both the remaining, we have excellent examples of the varied and capable art of Massinger. *The Maid of Honor* (written probably before 1622) retells from Painter's *Palace of Pleasure* how the Lady Camiola ransomed Roberto, a king's base brother and knight of Malta, from a captivity which his own rash act of war had brought upon him.[3] Although Camiola had rejected Roberto as a suitor on the score of his vows to his order, she now accepted his troth-plight as a test of his gratitude; but Roberto, having fallen before the blandishments of Aurelia, Duchess of Sienna, and proving false both to Camiola and to his knightly vows, Camiola denounces him, Aurelia repudiates him, and as he kneels repentant Camiola forgives, but, bidding him return to his order, herself assumes the veil. Adorni, a faithful but hopeless suitor, who undertakes his Lady Camiola's commission to ransom Roberto, is a third personage, admirably conceived, but not quite successfully carried out. Nor should the excellent foolery of Sylli, a lighter and less elaborate Sir Amorous

*The Maid of Honor*, 1622.

[1] *The Parliament of Love* is not here included as it is really a comedy of manners.

[2] Above, p. 39.

[3] This play does not occur in Herbert's list. It was acted at the Phœnix by the Queen's men, though this may have been later.

La Foole, be forgotten among the characters of this deservedly favorite play.

*The Renegado, 1624.*

*The Renegado or the Gentleman of Venice* was licensed in 1624 and is traceable directly to a comedy of Cervantes, *Los Baños de Argel*, printed in 1615.[1] The scene, which is laid in Tunis, reminds the reader, in its Eastern setting, of Heywood's *Fair Maid of the West*. But the atmosphere of *The Renegado* is utterly in contrast with that refreshing comedy of adventure. Massinger's tragicomedy combines the story of a Christian turned Mahometan and pirate, but brought to a realization of his crimes against God and man by misfortune, with the search by Vitelli, a Venetian gentleman, for his sister who has been sold into captivity in the court of the Viceroy of Tunis by the renegade. Vitelli, though disguised as a merchant, inspires a passion in the Turkish Princess Donusa, while Paulina, Vitelli's sister, is preserved in virtue, even in the harem of the Viceroy, by a miraculous talisman or amulet which hangs about her neck. The Princess, whose amour with Vitelli has brought them both to prison, turns Christian, and in the upshot all escape in the galley of the contrite renegade. The motive power of the plot lies in the beneficent Jesuit, Francisco, a character exceedingly well conceived and characteristically thrust not too prominently forward. The choice of such a theme as this and of the martyr Dorothea, together with the *dénouement* of *The Maid of Honor*, has led to the surmise that Massinger was a member of the Church of Rome; and his intimacy with the Earl of Carnarvon and with Sir Aston Cockayne, both of them of the

Massinger's alleged Roman Catholicism.

[1] Koeppel, ii, 97; and see, also, T. Heckmann, Massinger's *The Renegado und seine spanischen Quellen*, Halle, 1905.

elder faith, makes this surmise altogether probable. It has even been thought that the poet forfeited the patronage of the Herberts by his apostasy to the English Church, though certain it is that the dedication of *The Bondman* was acceptable to Philip, Earl of Montgomery, the younger brother of William Herbert, the then Earl of Pembroke. It is interesting to recall, in this connection, the familiar fact that in the preceding year the first folio of Shakespeare had been dedicated to the same pair of noble patrons.

*The Great Duke of Florence*, 1627;

*The Picture*, 1629;

*A Very Woman*, revised, 1634;

In four other tragicomedies Massinger continued his contributions to the drama in the reign of King Charles. *The Great Duke of Florence*, licensed in 1627, is a pleasing refashioning of an old play entitled *A Knack to Know a Knave*, transformed from an English atmosphere to that of conventional Italy and wide of the slightest historical relations. *The Picture*, which was licensed two years later, takes its title from a miniature of his wife which a Hungarian knight, named Mathias, wears hung about his neck. This miniature has the magic property of changing countenance as its original changes in loyalty to the wearer. By means of the pride and intrigue of the Princess Honoria, both husband and wife are submitted to the ordeal of temptation, but both in the end prove true at heart.[1] *A Very Woman* is an abler play. Revised by Massinger in 1634, this tragicomedy has been variously identified with *The Woman's Plot* or *A Right Woman*, acted originally in 1621, and with *The Spanish Viceroy* of a year

[1] In two other theses of Halle, by E. Gerhardt and A. Merle, both of 1905, the sources of these plays are set forth, though the first seems unacquainted with *A Knack to Know a Knave*.

earlier.[1] The single but somewhat intricate plot turns upon the scorn with which Almira, an imperious beauty of the court, dismisses an honorable suitor, the Prince of Tarent, who, insulted by his successful rival, Cardenas, fights him and leaves him for dead. In the end Cardenas recovers from his wound and from his affection for Almira as well, and that lady, learning to know the Prince's worth in his disguise of a slave, claims his love and marries him. Finally, in *The Bashful Lover*, acted in 1635, we meet the last of Massinger's plays now remaining extant, and one which, in the fullness and variety of its episodes, is no unworthy successor to all but the best of Fletcher in its type. In the absence of any discovery of a definite source, Koeppel has recourse to Shakespearean reminiscences, of which it must be confessed that this play affords several examples.[2] The plot, however, with its diffident hero, a prince in disguise, whose valor rescues the right princess at the right moment; with its Viola, or Bellario-like page who can tell "a pretty tale of a sister," nursing back to life and to fidelity her recreant lover, — all this is really of the universal stuff of drama, though memorable in this example for its successful combination of familiar personages and familiar scenes in the equally familiar atmosphere of pseudo-historical Italy. The wonder is that so genuinely pleasing a result could be produced with such hackneyed material.[3]

*The Bashful Lover*, 1635.

[1] Fleay, i, 215, 227. The source of this play is *El Amante Liberal* of Cervantes; see J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's translation of the *Novelas Exemplares*, i, p. xxxvi.

[2] Koeppel, ii, 146.

[3] Several plays of Massinger's, all of them supposedly non-extant, occur in Herbert's licenses between the years 1627 and 1640. *The Judge* and *The Honor of Women* were licensed respectively in 1627

Massinger's moral earnestness;

Massinger's contribution to tragicomedy consists, above many other things, in a certain moral earnestness which instinctively preferred themes and involved the presentation of personages for this very reason new to the stage. A common player, most despised of men in Roman times, rising in his manhood to the respect of his enemy, the Emperor of the world; the pathetic figure of a dethroned monarch, hopeless claimant against the tyranny of Rome; a virgin martyr winning a soul for Heaven in her own martyrdom, such are Massinger's themes in tragedy.[1] Nor is this same originality in serious motive less conspicuous in the poet's tragicomedies. The "Maid of Honor," renouncing love for the cloister on conviction that her lover is unworthy of her; the Prince of

and 1628. Both were in Warburton's list. Fleay thinks the first capable of identification with *The Fatal Dowry*, and that the second is *The Spanish Viceroy*, registered in 1653, *Minerva's Sacrifice or The Forced Lady*, licensed 1629, and *Alexias, the Chaste Lover*, 1639, are likewise in Warburton's list. Fleay surmises the former to be the title of Massinger's alteration of *The Queen of Corinth*. Other licensed plays of Massinger not already named in the text are *The Unfortunate Piety*, 1631, which is entered with the additional title *The Italian Nightpiece* in the Stationers' Register, and which Fleay thinks the same with Fletcher's *Double Marriage;* secondly *Cleander*, 1634, possibly one with *The Wandering Lovers or The Painter; The Orator*, 1635, registered in 1653 with the alternative title *The Noble Choice*, and by Fleay identified with *The Elder Brother;* and lastly, *The Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo*, 1640, entered in the Register as *The Prisoner or the Fair Anchoress*. Warburton's list discloses, besides the two lost plays mentioned in Henslowe (see above, p, 229, note 1), *The Woman's Plot*, *The Tyrant*, and *Feast and Welcome*, concerning which Fleay's further surmises may be consulted by those unwilling to leave anything unsettled. Fleay, i, 223–229.

[1] Cf. *The Roman Actor*, *Believe as You List*, and *The Virgin Martyr*.

Tarent, winning his beloved almost against her will by his steadfastness and honorable reserve; the story of one who had profaned religion, and was won back by conscience and remorse, such are the corresponding subjects of Massinger's tragicomedies.[1] We may grant, then, that Massinger's personages are often wanting in the subtler qualities of dramatic characterization, that they occasionally fall into types and colorless abstractions from his want of humor, and fail — though not always — of the highest ideals from his want of poetry. We may confess, too, that Massinger, like Shirley after him, showed himself a close and capable student of the great dramatists who had preceded him, in almost every way in which one writer may be legitimately indebted to another. But with themes such as these, treated with a consummate mastery of stagecraft and with a constructive skill inferior to no one of his great contemporaries, none can deny Massinger's claim to a high place among original dramatists.

his characterization;

and stagecraft.

Neither Fletcher nor Massinger were without their contemporary imitators; and even some of the greater men sought to shape their work to the new and favorite mode. Thus, Dekker in his *Match Me in London*, revived at the Phœnix in 1623, produced a Fletcherian tragicomedy, involving the familiar figures of a ruthless king and a citizen's chaste wife, and fully deserving the very high praise that has been bestowed upon it.[2] The same poet's *Wonder of a Kingdom*, identified by Fleay with *Come and See a Wonder*, licensed by Herbert in 1623 as by John Day, is of like

Influence of Fletcherian tragicomedy on his greater contemporaries.

[1] Cf. *A Very Woman* and *The Renegado*.

[2] E. Rhys in his Introduction to the Mermaid edition of Dekker, xxxix.

general character, although fuller of intrigue and humor and a far inferior production; [1] while Heywood's *Captives*, 1624, already described, is classical in origin and domestic in the subject-matter involved.[2] Among plays in which William Rowley coöperated with Middleton, several display a strong element of romance. The serious question involved in *A Fair Quarrel* raises that fine play above the level of mere comedy, but its atmosphere is realistic, not romantic.[3] On the other hand, the atmosphere and scene, Madrid, derived, as we have seen, from two stories of Cervantes, place *The Spanish Gipsy*, written by the same two poets about 1622, quite within the category of Fletcherian tragicomedy.[4] When Middleton writes alone, we have, as in *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's*, 1613, only a tinge of romance; or, as in *More Dissemblers Besides Women*, about 1622, little more, despite its conventional Italian setting, than a comedy of intrigue. If Rowley had any part in *The Thracian Wonder* (variously dated), we have a "romance" in its old heroical elements and pastoral touch in greatest contrast to the new school of tragicomedy; while Rowley and Webster's *A Cure for a Cuckold* (about 1618) repeats the time-honored test by which a lady, to prove her lover's devotion, bids him kill his own best friend, and in this and the diverting if improper underplot is once more pure comedy of manners. If there be a genuine claim among the comedies of Fletcher's greater contemporaries, beside that of *The Spanish Gipsy*, to a place among his tragicomedies, it is perhaps that of

[1] Fleay, i, 136.

[2] See above, i, p. 352.

[3] For a consideration of this play, see above, i, p. 350.

[4] For an account of this play and its sources, both from the *Novelas Exemplares*, see above, pp. 216, 217.

*The Devil's Law Case* by Webster, 1623, derived, it is said, from a story in Goulart's *Histoire Admirable.*[1] But even here we have tragicomedy mainly in the gravity of the passions involved, and the romantic note is to a large degree wanting in a story of intricate intrigue.[2] The Stationers' Register of 1612 discloses the entry of a production called "*The Nobleman*, a tragicomedy by Cyril Tourneur," which a manuscript note of Oldys declares was acted at court in 1613. We cannot but deplore the loss of a play of this type from the hand of the author of *The Revenger's Tragedy;* though perhaps if we had it intact, it might bear no better relation to Tourneur's work in tragedy than *The Devil's Law Case* bears to *The Duchess of Malfi.*

Lesser Fletcherian tragicomedies;

Among the lesser authors writing in the time of King James there is often palpable imitation of Fletcher. Thus, in a "tragicomedy," *The Twins*, by Richard Niccols, first acted in 1612 or 1613, and later revised by William Rider," the hendecasylabic verse of Fletcher is consciously imitated, and the plot is made up of the improbable horror of a wife's lust after her husband's twin brother, the husband impersonating the brother, and thus converting tragedy into tragicomedy. *Swetnam the Woman Hater Arraigned by Women*, 1620, is an exceedingly able anonymous play in which is treated quite independently the interesting theme of Fletcher's *Women Pleased.*[3] Which drama preceded it would be impossible to say, and only a closer study than I am able at present to

[1] Langbaine, 509; doubtless, as Sampson has suggested, Grimestone is Webster's real source.

[2] The plot of this, as of so many of our old minor dramas, is given crudely but faithfully by Genest, x, 16.

[3] See Grosart's ed. of this play, *Occasional Issues*, 1875–81, vol. xiv.

give to the source of both, the story of *Aurelio y Isabella*, by Juan de Flores, could determine the probabilities of the case. It seems likely that we have here an instance, by no means unexampled, of two authors employing simultaneously the same material.

*Swetnam*, 1620; As to *Swetnam*, although the main plot concerns the question which of two lovers is guilty of taking the initiative in love, with a contest between them in disinterestedness, the title is derived from the name of an actual person who had written various pamphlets, one of them containing an abusive attack on the fair sex. Swetnam is represented on the stage as a self-sufficient attorney for the prosecution of the Princess, who is on trial for having dared to find a lover for herself without her father's will. And the pamphleteer is held up to general ridicule and obloquy. It is of interest to note in passing that, in 1620 and for a year or two thereafter, the eternal question of woman's dependence or independence of man was a favorite topic on the popular stage. Besides the two plays just discussed, there was the non-extant *Woman's Plot*, one of the manuscripts destroyed by the folly of Warburton, and an anonymous production entitled *The Female Rebellion*.[1] There is, besides, *The Sea Voyage* of Fletcher, in which a commonwealth of women sufficient to themselves constitutes one of the features of the story. Not improbably the lost plays of 1623, *The Way to Content All Women*, by Gunnell, and *Hard Shift for Husbands*, by Samuel Rowley, belong to the same group, in which the comedy of manners holds an equal sway with more romantic material.[2] Another

other "women's plays" of this period.

[1] Reprinted by Alexander Smith of Glasgow, 1872, from a manuscript in the Hunterian Museum, Glasgow.

[2] Collier, i, 446, 447.

tragicomedy on the Fletcherian model is *The Heir* of Thomas May, 1620, which, although it refashions the old and trite material, — the lustful king and the steadfast maiden, long-lost brothers, a feud between two noble houses, and the like, — is an interesting and well-written play, and notable for a certain power of genuine pathos. *The Two Noble Ladies or The Converted Conjurer*, "acted oftentimes with approbation at the Red Bull by the company of the Revels," and about the same date, is described by Bullen as "coarse and noisy."[1] *Tell Tale*, the scene of which is laid in Florence, still remains in manuscript in an imperfect copy in Dulwich College. From Warner and Bullen's description of it, it evidently belongs to the tragicomic type.[2] Its comic scenes are reported by Bullen to suggest William Rowley at his worst.[3]

These, with a few scattering plays no longer extant, complete our account of dramas of this type in the reign of James. But the tale of tragicomedy is by no means at an end; for the time of King Charles was *par excellence* the thriving period of this variety of drama. But with that reign came new authors and new influences to affect this as well as other types of the drama. It seems wiser to pause here with the completion of the impulse which Fletcher and Massinger gave to tragicomedy rather than to pass prematurely on to the new problems which the new age involved.

[1] *Egerton MS.* 1994, pp. 224–244; Bullen, *Old Plays*, ii, 430. Fleay, ii, 334, dates this play 1619–1622.

[2] Warner, *Catalogue of Dulwich College*, 342.

[3] *Old Plays*, ii, 417.

# XVIII

## LATER COMEDY OF MANNERS

Jonson and Middleton's influence on later comedy.

IN a previous chapter, that on London life and the comedy of manners, two varieties of realistic comedy were distinguished : that which was content to picture life directly, if sometimes crudely, as it appeared to the contemporary observer, who was less concerned to reprehend vice and laud virtue than to represent things pleasingly and frankly; and secondly, that kind of comedy which studied the world about it, but which insisted on representing it more or less with reference to the ancients and their usages, and with the ever-conscious attitude of a moral censor. Such was, in brief, the striking contrast between Middletonian and Jonsonian comedy, a contrast not to be blurred by the fact that Jonson was, for the most part, far too good an artist to carry his theories to the excesses in practice which critics who have not studied him are wont to declare. The bulk of Middleton's comedies of manners range, as we have seen, between 1604 and 1613. *Bartholomew Fair*, 1614, is Jonson's latest play unmistakably of the type; although the later dramas of Jonson, shortly to claim our attention, despite their return to the harder lines and underlying allegory of the dramatic satires, are none the less full of telling contemporary strokes and in essence still of the comedy of manners. The later comedy of manners, when at its best, combines the freedom and unconsciousness of Middleton with the constructive

excellence and artistic seriousness of Jonson; though it is not to be denied that the two contrasted modes of viewing life persisted more or less independently to the end.

Stage history, 1614–25.

But before we proceed to the discussion of this later comedy, let us return to the history of the stage, to record in brief the more important matters between the years 1614 and 1625. Historians of the stage note a species of "interregnum in theatrical proceedings" during the years 1614 and 1615. Fleay finds the reasons for this in the closing of the Swan, the recent burning of the Globe, and "the continuous quarrels of extortionate Henslowe with his company," deterring the best poets from production.[1] He notes as further evidence of this depression that the most active playwright of the moment was "insignificant Daborne," who, with Rossiter and others, became patentee of the second company of the Queen's Revels in January, 1610, and for them composed the better known of his two extant plays, *The Christian Turned Turk*.[2] The correspondence of Daborne with Henslowe concerning his hack work for the Princess Elizabeth's company during several months of 1613 and 1614 affords us an interesting glimpse into the needy, reckless, and improvident life of a minor playwright, producing under pressure of his immediate necessities seven plays (in whole or in part) between April of the former year and the following March, and being paid, for the most part, in advance before his work was ready.[3] After the rebuilding of the Globe in 1614,

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 253.

[2] See above, i, p. 292.

[3] The plays in question are *Macchiavel and the Devil*, *The Arraignment of London*, *The Honest Man's Fortune* (according to *Fleay*, i, 77), with Field, Fletcher, and Massinger, *The Bellman*

and the death of Henslowe, in January, 1616, dramatic activity revived. The King's company obtained now the services of Field as actor and perhaps as playwright, a circumstance which, added to the invincible Burbage and to the excellences of the authors, Fletcher and Massinger, enabled them easily to maintain their primacy. The Prince's players at the Curtain were now strengthened by the services of Middleton. The Queen's men fared less well at the Bull, and, on the death of their royal patron in 1619, were succeeded there by the Revels men, shortly to be followed by the Prince's company, now finally removed from the old Curtain. The Palsgrave's company played continuously during this period at the Fortune, but their earlier plays perished when that theater was burned in 1621. The Hope was occupied jointly from 1614 to 1616 by the Prince's and the Lady Elizabeth's players; after the latter date an effort was made to secure for them a better theater by converting a private house in Blackfriars, near Puddle Wharf, into a playhouse. This venture failed, and the company divided, the Prince's succeeding the Queen's at the Fortune, the Lady Elizabeth's company — after December, 1618, known as the Queen of Bohemia's — moving to a new theater, the Cockpit in Drury Lane.[1] Another abortive theatrical venture of this time was the attempt of John Daniel, the musician and brother of Samuel Daniel, to establish a troupe of actors for travel in the provinces. Daniel

*of London*, *The Owl*, *The Faithful Friends*, and *The She Saint*. Daborne's other extant play, *The Poor Man's Comfort*, has already claimed our attention above, p. 162; the correspondence mentioned in the text will be found in *The Alleyn Papers*, 48–82.

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 263–300.

secured a patent in 1615; but the prejudices of the provincial folk were strong.[1] The mayor of Exeter, for example, discovered that the patent empowered the acting of plays "by children." So finding that, save for three boys, the company was made up of adults, he refused them permission to act under such a license.[2] We hear no more of this attempt to establish a provincial stage after 1618. The King's players suffered an irreparable loss in the death, in March, 1619, of their great actor, Richard Burbage, creator of the most important rôles of Shakespeare and Fletcher. Burbage's mantle fell on John Lowin, and later on Joseph Taylor, both of whom continued the serious traditions of the elder stage.[3] In May, 1622, Sir John Ashley was appointed Master of the Revels, succeeding Sir George Buc, now incapacitated. From August, 1623, Sir Henry Herbert acted as Ashley's deputy, succeeding to the office on Ashley's death in 1629.[4]

A few comedies of manners remain in these later

[1] *Ibid.* 308. [2] *Ibid.* 310.

[3] John Lowin was born in 1576, and began acting as one of the Earl of Worcester's players at the Rose. By 1608 he had become a sharer in the Blackfriars theater, and, after the retirement of Heming and Condell, about 1623, the management of the King's company devolved upon him and Taylor. At the outbreak of the civil war Lowin was keeping a tavern at Brentford, and he is said to have died in poverty, a very old man, in 1659, or, as some say, in 1669. Joseph Taylor was born in 1586, and became a sharer in the Globe as early as 1607. After several changes of company, he returned to the King's players about the time of the death of Burbage and succeeded to most of his rôles. In 1639 Taylor became "keeper of the King's vestures" under Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels. Taylor is one of the several actors who took part in the publication of the folio of the works of Beaumont and Fletcher in 1647. The date of Taylor's death is unknown.

[4] Fleay, *Stage*, 310; Collier, i, 419.

Late Jacobean comedies of the elder dramatists.

days of King James, the work of elder men. Besides Jonson and Middleton, Fletcher alone continued active in this kind, though William Rowley bore his part in collaboration and Webster shared in one play of the type. Webster's partnership with Dekker in the gross realism of *Westward* and *Northward Hoe* has received our attention.[1] Neither poet found his forte in productions of this kind, although Webster with the aid of Rowley returned to the type in the coarse but humorous underplot which gives *A Cure for a Cuckold* its ribald title. Two serious stories are involved as well in this comedy: Clare's irrational test of her lover's devotion by her demand that he kill his best friend, and the interesting adventures whereby a young gentleman, driven to desperation and about to turn thief, is reclaimed by an unexpected confidence in his honor. While the hand of Rowley is patent in the underplot, there seems no reason to deprive Webster of a share in this excellent comedy. With his "Duchess" in mind, the admirable womanliness of Annabel, the bride, alone should settle this question; though the surer proofs by parallel recently advanced are heartily welcome.[2] As to Middleton, the comedies which he contributed to the closing years of the reign of King James are, almost to a play, foreign in scene and romantic in tone. Indeed, it seems not unlikely that the comedies of English scene and more strictly of manners which are connected with his name and which fall within this period are, every one of them, revivals of older work.[3] To this change in the character of Middle-

[1] Above, i, p. 502.

[2] See the discussion of this play by Stoll, *Webster*, 34–41.

[3] Cf. *A New Wonder, Anything for a Quiet Life, The Widow*,

ton's work several things contributed: the collaboration of Rowley, the example of Fletcher, and the romantic trend of the age. It was in 1614 that the union of the Lady Elizabeth's players with those of the Prince Charles threw Rowley and Middleton together, although they seem not to have coöperated until two years later, when their admirable domestic drama, *A Fair Quarrel*, was staged.[1] Fleay assigns a revival of *The Old Law* to much the same date; and *The Witch*, *More Dissemblers Besides Women*, and *The Spanish Gipsy* followed in the early twenties. Of the first enough has been said; the third belongs to the domain of tragicomedy and has already been treated above. *More Dissemblers Besides Women* was recorded as an old play in 1622.[2] Therein the Lord Cardinal of Milan, an unctuously eloquent old prelate, felicitates himself on the possession of two models of youthful virtue, the widowed Duchess and his own nephew, Lactantio. The Cardinal's ideals are shattered in the intrigue which follows, which appears conducted with an intent fully to justify the title. Such pathos as might attach to the wronged maid who attends the roué Lactantio in the inevitable disguise of a page is ruined by a grossness of speech only too characteristically Middletonian. Among the comedies of Middleton, none is so typical of his adequacy, his mediocrity, and his careless control of the intricacies of intrigue as this, the latest of his many contributions to works of its class.

*More Dissemblers Besides Women*, before 1622.

and *The Puritan Maid*. See Fleay, ii, 103, and above, i, pp. 515, 518; ii, pp. 262, 263.

[1] Above, vii, 250, 251.

[2] Allowed by Sir George Buc and therefore before May, 1622, the month of his resignation.

English and foreign setting in later comedy.

The scene of *More Dissemblers* is Milan, its gypsies suggest a Spanish contact.[1] After *Wit Without Money* and *The Night Walker*, both of which must certainly have been on the stage before the death of Shakespeare, Fletcher, like Middleton, seems wholly to have given over English scenes and settings, and to have preferred thereafter a French or Spanish environment for comedy. Thus, *The Little French Lawyer* declares its scene in its title. But *The Wild Goose Chase*, *The Elder Brother*, and *The Noble Gentleman* are likewise laid in France; while *The Spanish Curate* and *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* are Spanish in scene as in source. This list might be readily increased by the inclusion of Fletcherian tragicomedies within the last five years of Fletcher's life. Oddly enough, on the other hand, Massinger's earliest unaided comedies, *The City Madam* and *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, both of which fall within this same period, are English in scene and character, although his probable hand in *The Little French Lawyer* and in *The Spanish Curate* prepares us to find his unaided *Parliament of Love* cast in France and his *Renegado* based on a Spanish model. We have practically thus at the beginning of our search into the later comedy of manners a distinction which means far more than an accidental choice of scene. The comedies in foreign setting shade more or less imperceptibly into tragicomedy and tinge their representations of the lighter passions with the colors of romance. The mere circumstance that a play is laid in London, contrastedly, ties it with surer tether to the actualities of every-day life. Whatever may have been his earlier bias towards the realistic comedy of

[1] See above, p. 218.

Middleton, it was Fletcher who guided Massinger to his true vocation in romantic drama. We shall see that the ever vital comedy of every-day life was carried forward in the hands of lesser men, such as Brome, Davenport, Nabbes, and others; but that Shirley, great romantic poet that he was, did not disdain a valuable contribution to it.

Later comedies of Fletcher: *The Little French Lawyer*, 1619.

And first as to the several comedies of manners in foreign garb in which Fletcher was concerned after 1618. It would be difficult to find a more thoroughly diverting and humorous comedy than *The Little French Lawyer*, even if some of its scenes are *risqué* to a degree. The scapegrace Dinant is both impudent and inventive in his pursuit of the lady who has been torn from him and married to an old poltroon;[1] but the minor character of the title rôle made the play. The little lawyer is pressed into service as a second in a duel, and by an accident comes off successful.[2] Thereupon he becomes a fire-eater and neglects his clients and their pleas until cured by being left with his opponent on a cold morning by their mischievous seconds without either weapons or doublets. The little French lawyer is a delightfully comical personage. Scarcely less excellent in its kind is the famous comedy of *The Wild Goose Chase*, the clever invention of Fletcher alone. Koeppel has called attention to the interesting parallel between the relation of Mirabel and Oriana in this play and Don Juan and Donna Elvira in Scribe's libretto of *Don Giovanni*.[3]

*The Wild Goose Chase*, c. 1621.

[1] This main plot, as already noted, is derived from the picaresque novel, *Guzman de Alfarache*.

[2] It is difficult to follow Koeppel, i, 61, in the Shakespearean parallel which he finds for this duel.

[3] *Ibid.* i, 103. Farquhar gave this comedy a new lease of life in his version, *The Inconstant*.

Unusual coarseness of speech about women and brutality of conduct towards them mark this play, but these are, unhappily, features recurrent especially in the comedies of Fletcher. A less boisterous comedy and one of higher type is *The Spanish Curate*, already mentioned above with *The Maid in the Mill* which Fletcher wrote with the aid of William Rowley soon after. Both plays draw on the same translated Spanish source.[1] Though an inferior play, *The Maid* is of much the type of *The Curate;* and both comedies, like so many in which Fletcher was concerned, stand between tragicomedy and comedy pure and simple.

*Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, 1624.

In *Rule a Wife and Have a Wife* we return to pure comedy of manners while still retaining touch with the literature of Spain. The minor plot tells how a penniless woman-in-waiting borrows house and servants of her mistress, and pretends to be a lady of fortune in order to win for her husband a gentleman adventurer who likewise pretends wealth, but is as penniless as herself. These personages are borrowed, even to their names, from *El Casamiento Engañoso*, the eleventh of the *Novelas Exemplares* of Cervantes. But the main plot, which this serves only to illustrate, describes how a wealthy lady, Margarita, desirous of finding a complaisant husband that she may enjoy a larger freedom than is hers as a maid, marries young Leon, who has been recommended to her by her confidant as a suitable man of straw. To her surprise, however, she soon finds that Leon is no milksop, but a capable and masterly man, who after a spirited struggle gains the upper hand, upholding all his rights, besides winning the respect and love of Margarita in the process. This capital plot has not

[1] Above, p. 210.

been traced, although it seems suggested by the familiar motive of the taming of a shrew, as the inverted story of "the tamer tamed" had been suggested to Fletcher some years before.[1] It has also been observed that Fletcher's story of Margarita and Leon is precisely that of Jonson's Morose and his "silent woman," inverted as to sex. The parallel is certainly interesting.[2] *The Elder Brother* has been identified by Fleay with *The Orator or the Noble Choice*, one of the Warburton manuscripts, and consequently one of the many plays of Fletcher revised by Massinger.[3] The story relates how Charles, the elder brother, wholly given over to melancholy and his books, is awakened by the charm of the society of a young woman who had been originally destined for him but was now betrothed to Eustace, his worldly younger brother; and how, in the upshot, Charles regained his mistress. No source has been determined for this pleasing comedy, which is full of fine thoughts and unusually well written even for Fletcher and Massinger. Koeppel, ever fertile in the discovery of likenesses, none the less suggests the classical parallel of Cimon transformed from a fool to a man by the power of beauty. He also calls attention to a singular resemblance between this story and that of one of the comedies of Calderon, *De Una Causa Dos Efectos*, and surmises a possible common source.[4] With *The Noble Gentleman*, which Fleay thinks was left unfinished by Fletcher, but which

*The Elder Brother*, revised after 1626.

[1] See above, i, p. 341.

[2] Koeppel, i, 115–117.

[3] Fleay, i, 228. Oliphant dates the first version of this play 1614; its revision, after 1626.

[4] Koeppel, i, 120, quoting Weber, who first noted this resemblance.

*The Noble Gentleman*, revised *c.* 1626.

Oliphant believes to have been an early venture of both Beaumont and Fletcher revised by Massinger, we conclude the enumeration of the comedies of manners in which Fletcher had a hand.[1] *The Noble Gentleman* turns in its main story on a gentleman's desire to return to country life, with the plots put upon him by his wife and her friends to retain him at court. It is, all considered, an inferior and purposeless production, little improved by the vagaries of a madman apparently borrowed from the similar personage of *The Nice Valor*.

Types in the personages of Fletcher's comedies.

Many allusions have already been made to the types of character towards which the personages of Fletcher are apt to tend, and the usual list of these personages in tragicomedy has been set forth with the necessary warning that, when all has been said, there remains a truly remarkable diversity amongst even the most typical of Fletcher's characters.[2] But the trend towards types is by no means confined to Fletcherian tragicomedy. The comedies developed certain personages of equally typical distinctness, although in no single case can it be said that Fletcher was the first to bring any one of these types upon the stage. In an excellent recent monograph on the dramatic art of Fletcher, his types in comedy are distinguished under the headings of "the clever maiden in love, the sentimental hero, the clever scapegrace, and the brave soldier." [3] The sentimental hero is not only the least interesting, but likewise the least distinctively Fletcherian. The brave soldier is common to every form of

[1] Fleay, i, 222; Oliphant, xv, 340.

[2] Above, pp. 195, 197.

[3] *John Fletcher, a Study in Dramatic Method*, by O. L. Hatcher, 1905, pp. 70–73.

Fletcher's plays. "The merry, resourceful maiden who can at all times use her head to help her heart, and who welcomes a jest even at her lover's expense," is distinctively Fletcher's; though both Field and Day rejoice in her wit and inventiveness, and her original is at least as old as Rosalind, if not far older. Some of Fletcher's women of this type are Belvedere in *Women Pleased*, Livia in *The Woman's Prize*, and, above all, Mary in *Monsieur Thomas*. On the other hand, the "disconsolate maidens who when fortune goes against their love, accept it meekly without thought of resistance," are regarded as peculiarly the creation of Beaumont.[1] As to the clever scapegrace, — Thomas in *Monsieur Thomas*, Valentine in *Wit Without Money*, and many more, — Fletcher assuredly borrowed him of Middleton, in whose hands he had already reached that perfection which unaffected realism can alone impart. Dryden claimed for Fletcher, as is well known, that he "understood and imitated the conversation of gentlemen much better" than did Shakespeare.[2] Allowing for the fact that the gentleman of Fletcher was nearly a generation nearer to the gentleman of the Restoration than were the characters of Shakespeare, the critic's remark was doubtless prompted alike by Fletcher's closer realism in minor detail to the conventional manners of his time and by his failure to paint his portraits in those larger and imperishable lines which endure to all time. Of Fletcher's gentlemen we cannot but feel, as of those of Vandyke, his later contemporary: they are indubitably portraits, their originals must have sat to the artist; but all have the same touch, the man-

His conventional realism.

[1] *Ibid.* 71.

[2] *Of Dramatic Poesy*, Scott-Saintsbury, *Dryden*, xv, 346.

nerism, albeit a pleasing one, of their author. And yet it is not fair to Fletcher to say that he was either uninterested or unsuccessful in the representation of common folk on the stage. When we consider how invariably it was his custom to add the low comedy figures to the characters already existing in his sources, how the former were thus nearly always invented, and how diverse they really are, none can deny the range and inventiveness of the comedy figures of Fletcher, readiest, easiest, and most uniformly capable master of his craft.

Massinger's comedies of London life: *The City Madam*, 1619.

It has already been intimated that Massinger, early in his career, contributed to the stage of his time two comedies of London life. These are *The City Madam* and *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, both of them among the most admirable productions of their type. *The City Madam* was licensed in 1632; but Fleay has assigned several good reasons for placing this comedy as early as 1619.[1] The material of this play is much that of *Eastward Hoe:* the rich city merchant, his foolish wife and daughters, fashion struck, their suitors, the attendant apprentices; but the plot takes a wholly different course, and one character, that of Luke Frugal, is developed to a degree and fullness equally typical of Massinger and unusual in the comedy of his day. Luke has been a spendthrift, and, redeemed from the debtors' prison by his rich younger brother, the merchant, Sir John Frugal, is treated as a menial in the household by the merchant's haughty wife and pert daughters. Alike to cure his extravagant family and to test his brother, whose conduct is suspiciously meek and exemplary, Sir John pretends to

[1] Fleay, i, 225–227, and see Ward, iii, 34, who upholds Massinger's authorship despite Fleay's doubts.

retire to a monastery and make over his wealth to Luke; but returns disguised as an Indian from Virginia, assigned to the wardship of Luke. Luke proves in every way unworthy of his trust. He deceives and sends to jail the associates of his earlier wild life, ruins several of Sir John's debtors, and is about to close with a proposal of the supposed Indian to rid himself of the charge of supporting Lady Frugal and her daughters by transporting them to Virginia, when Sir John discloses himself. Whether for character, admirably sustained and distinguished, for witty and natural dialogue, or for clever construction, this comedy leaves little to be desired; and it is scarcely bettered in the more widely known *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, certainly on the stage by 1625.[1] This last is by all odds the most popular of Massinger's plays. It has held the stage practically without interruption since Garrick's revival of it in 1745, and has deserved its reputation. Here once more we meet with a personage, in the famous Sir Giles Overreach, who rises in his colossal greed and unrestrained violence through a series of situations of consummate dramatic conception to a dignity beyond the usual range of comedy. Nor is Welborn, his foil, though a commoner type, less well conceived. It has been well said that *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* owes its success no less to its effective dramatic conception than to "a strong didactic element, clothed in rhetoric of a very striking kind." [2] Herein, in short, lies the reason for the lon-

*A New Way to Pay Old Debts*, 1625.

[1] Fleay places the first performance of *A New Way* at 1622; Boyle at 1625. I cannot find anything more of Fletcher in it than might have been caught by a collaborator writing for the nonce by himself.

[2] Ward, iii, 21–22.

gevity of Massinger's comedy on the stage, when neither *A Trick to Catch the Old One*, possibly the play which suggested Massinger's, nor *Eastward Hoe* with its many merits could hold its own.[1] In *A New Way*, too, is illustrated that union of the two varieties of the earlier comedies of manners already distinguished, Middleton's realistic play of contemporary life and Jonson's didactic and constructively more perfect comedy of humors. In this comedy and in *The City Madam* we have the gayety, the lightness, the natural movement and obvious realism of Middleton; but we find in them likewise an underlying gravity and moral consciousness, and a constructiveness and rhetorical excellence which, taken together, constitute much of Jonson's generous contribution to English comedy. Massinger in these two comedies of contemporary English life presents to us a higher social grade than the more strictly bourgeois types of Jonson's comedies or of Middleton in the latter's plays of London life; and if the Jonsonian method of building up a character from a single trait is patent in the names of Massinger's *dramatis personae*, — Tradewell, a merchant, Holdfast, a steward, Stargaze, an astrologer, Order, Amble, Furnace, and Watchall, servants to Lady Allworth, — the author confines this method for the most part to his minor personages, and contrives to produce in his chief characters that impression of personality which the recognition of human beings as creatures of mixed motives can alone effect.

Massinger's combination of Middletonian and Jonsonian comedy.

Two other comedies of Massinger exhibit, with greater or less clearness, the effects of his association with Fletcher in their somewhat conventional setting and foreign scene and in a certain tinge of the

Massinger's comedies on foreign themes: *The Parliament of Love*, 1624.

[1] Koeppel, ii, 138.

romantic which enters into plot and character alike. *The Parliament of Love*, acted in 1624, has come down to us in an imperfect state, and is a disappointing performance, combining several familiar situations, such as the exhortation of an incensed mistress to her lover to kill his best friend, a repetition of the device by which Helena wins back her husband, Bertram, in *All's Well*, and the like. The extraordinarily coarse underplot sinks the whole product to the level of a mere comedy of manners; and no part, albeit the scene is laid in the court of Charles VII of France, is more disappointing than the love court, which has nothing in common with the practices of the middle ages on which the notion is based.[1] *The Guardian*, staged in 1633, is equally complex and a far abler production. Here the scene is laid in Italy, but the intrigue, although not definitely traced to a source, is Spanish in character and worked out in a manner worthy of the constructive talents of Lope de Vega himself. A gentleman banished and become a benevolent outlaw, pardoned in the end by the return of his supposed victim; love at cross purposes, with the entanglement of an elopement in which a rival carries off the lady and the would-be bridegroom is fain to content himself with my lady's maid; a husband unexpectedly returned, to find his wife arrayed to meet a lover, with her subterfuges to escape vengeance,—such is the trite romantic material of which this comedy is constructed. But all is combined so cleverly as to give an effect entirely novel and to produce from its intentional humor and extravagance a result wide of the seriousness of tragicomedy. The

*The Guardian*, 1633.

[1] Koeppel, ii, 107, refers us for the original idea of this play to Martial d'Auvergne, *Aresta Amorum*, 1555.

minor personage who gives title to the play, the humorous and coarse-spoken Guazzo, is not to be recommended on the score of his opinions or for his ideals of life, though by no means the worst offender of the play in this respect. *The Guardian*, because of this and because of a certain flippancy of tone which calls forth from Koeppel the remark that this play would offer an excellent plot for an *opera bouffe*, contrasts notably with the romantic refinement of *The Great Duke of Florence*, not to mention the more serious moods of plays like *The Renegado*, and thus offers us an obvious reason for including these last among tragicomedies while denying such a place to the two kindred dramas just described.

Daubridgcourt Belchier; his *Hans Beer-Pot*, 1618.

Among the many comedies of manners by minor authors which cluster in the latter years of the reign of King James, two especially mark the varying borderline which lies between true drama and work of other intent assuming the dramatic form. Daubridgcourt Belchier was a gentleman of good family and an Oxford man resident, apparently in some military capacity, at Utrecht.[1] There he wrote his one play, published in London under the title *Hans Beer-Pot, his Invisible Comedy of See Me and See Me Not*, "acted in the Low Countries by an honest company of Health Drinkers." This production is accurately described by the author as "nor comedy nor tragedy, as wanting first the just number of speakers; secondarily, those parts or acts it should have." It consists of a series of dialogues between one Harmant, a country gentleman, and his wife, Hans, their servant, and several

[1] See the dedication of this play to "Sir John Ogle, Collonell of our regiment of foot under the Lords the Estates generall of the United Provinces."

personages who frequent the tavern of Josske Flutterkin. The talk is of good fellowship and martial conduct, and shows a soldier's interest in contemporary events. It is difficult to believe this little dialogue with its English tone and patriotic passages a translation from the Dutch, as it is usually described.[1] Equally removed from the true drama is *Two Wise Men and the Rest Fools*, "a comical moral censuring the follies of the age, as it hath been divers times acted, Anno 1619." This is little more than a series of dialogues between various persons,—Proberio, Simplo, Busatrato, and the like, to the number of some thirty,—satirically representing types of the age and containing little or no action. Some of the personages are cleverly conceived and the dialogue is often exceedingly witty.[2] Fleay attempts to show that this play was written chiefly to satirize Anthony Munday, who, however, so far as we know, seems by 1619 to have retired from active authorship into his hereditary trade of draper.[3] Collier notes the epilogue of this play as "the most recent instance" of a prayer offered up by the actors for the sovereign.[4] This cannot be regarded as anything but an accidental recurrence to a custom obsolete in the time of James for at least a generation.

*Two Wise Men*, 1619.

Two new names first appear among dramatists in the early twenties. These are Thomas May, already

[1] Note the tone of the passages on Elizabeth and her great sea-captains, B4 and G4 verso.

[2] See, especially, the character of the Puritan wife who holds the birch of correction for her husband in her hand while reading her Bible.

[3] Fleay, ii, 333, and *Dictionary of National Biography*, xxxix, 293.

[4] Collier, iii, 445.

mentioned above for his honorable contributions to English tragedy on Roman history, and for his successful tragicomedy, *The Heir;* [1] and Robert Davenport, memorable, if for no other work, for his powerful tragedy, *King John and Matilda.*[2] May's only comedy is *The Old Couple*, which, although not printed until 1658, Fleay regards as having preceded *The Heir*, which was acted in 1620. Additional reason for this view is to be found in the nature of this comedy, which exhibits a simplicity and want of acquaintance with the stage on its practical side, neither of which is characteristic of the more imitative *Heir*. *The Old Couple* is originally conceived as to plot and suggests acquaintance with the methods of Jonson. The Lady Covet, described as "at least four score," and Sir Argent Scrape, "this year four score and fifteen," both of them decrepit and wheeled about in chairs by their servants, are conceived as about to solemnize a marriage, each hoping to outlive the other and gain the other's wealth. Sir Argent has a nephew, Eugeny, in hiding for the supposed murder of Scudamore, who has been cheated out of his manor by the Lady Covet, and now lives disguised as her chaplain. Scudamore induces the Lady to make over her property to trustees that it may be kept out of Argent's control when they shall be married, and then informs Argent of her act, thus breaking off the match. Argent plots to have Eugeny executed for the murder of Scudamore that he may enjoy the entail of his nephew's estate. In the end both young men regain their estates and incidentally their sweethearts.[3] The theme, a regeneration

May's *The Old Couple*, 1619.

[1] Above, pp. 43–45, 339.

[2] Above, p. 304.

[3] Why May should have chosen the name Euphues for minor

from avarice, is further illustrated by the reclaiming of miserly Earthworm from niggardliness by his virtuous son. This play is worthy of more attention than it has received, less for its merit, though that is not inconsiderable, than for its originality of theme and plan. The old couple, despite their descriptive names, are not altogether mere abstractions, although the moral intent is unmistakable.

Robert Davenport, fl. 1624: *The City Nightcap*, 1624.

Of the life of Robert Davenport next to nothing is known; even the usual dedications to persons of note are wanting in his plays to establish his relations of patronage or friendship, and his "divine and moral" poems afford no help.[1] Davenport is the author of two extant comedies both of which were in all likelihood on the stage before the accession of King Charles. *The City Nightcap*, licensed by Herbert in 1624, partakes somewhat of the nature of tragicomedy, the scene being laid in Italy and some of its adventures involving more or less serious emotions. *A New Trick to Cheat the Devil*, contrastedly tends towards mere farce and is, in its essence, a comedy of London manners. Both are full of event and much elaborated. *The City Nightcap* is constructed on the basis of the contrasted situations of a true woman foully maligned by her jealous lord and a false woman absurdly trusted by a foolish husband. The husband of Abstimia, the first of these, sets his friend to try his wife, and failing thus to unsettle her constancy, suborns slaves as witnesses to swear that she is false.

characters, a young gentleman in *The Old Couple*, an old lord in *The Heir*, it would be difficult to explain.

[1] For Davenport's *King John and Matilda*, see p. 304. See, also, the Introduction to Davenport's *Works* by Bullen, *Old English Plays*, n. s. iii.

The second husband is over-confident, but is fooled by his wife, though in the end he convicts her of her wantonness by pretending to be her confessor, and she is banished to a convent. After repentance and much ingeniously devised vicissitude, the husband of Abstimia, false, jealously infatuated, and brutal though he has been, regains his wife and, after the easy manner of tragicomedy, is forgiven. The story of Abstimia is plainly that of the Curious Impertinent in *Don Quixote*, already utilized, as we have seen, in more than one English play before this. On the other hand, much of the intrigue of the wanton wife harks back to the *Decameron*, though it may well be questioned in both cases (considering Davenport's making over of old dramatic material in his *King John*) whether both plots were not borrowed direct from intervening English plays.[1] Abstimia in the brothel scenes seems clearly suggested by the similar plight of Marina in *Pericles*.[2] Indeed, it might be difficult to find a plainer example of the later composite art of dramatic reconstruction than is offered by this comedy, though it is neither ill-conceived nor carelessly wrought out.

*A New Trick to Cheat the Devil*, pr. 1639.

*A New Trick to Cheat the Devil* presents us once more to familiar and typical personages: a lord and a poor gentleman both suitors to a fair maid, a foolish mother ambitious of station, a prudent, if somewhat hen-pecked, husband. But the material is ingeniously handled and in a novel way. Anne, the betrothed of Slightall, is won by her mother to entertain the suit of Lord Skales. Slightall turns spendthrift in his disappointment and finally runs mad. He is induced to play Faustus to the

[1] For the source, see *Decameron*, vii, 7.

[2] *The City Nightcap*, iv, i; *Pericles*, iv, ii.

Mephistopheles of Changeable, Anne's father, making in his madness the usual bond rendering his soul to damnation on the complete payment, with means supplied by the devil, of all his debts. In the event, Changeable succeeds in getting Anne married to her old lover by the absurd device of feigning a marriage for him with a she-devil. The infernal bond is kept in the circumstance that Slightall has not, and cannot, satisfy Changeable, who has paid his son-in-law's debts. The diverting underplot of the friar who conjures for a supper is nearer in form to the Scottish poem, *The Freires of Berwick* (published in Scotland in editions of 1603 and 1622), than the similar story in *The History of Friar Bacon.*[1] Both of these comedies of Davenport are well written if over-elaborated, and both are far from unambitious efforts at the original use of old material. Davenport tries hard, but he is not quite a poet; he never labors so unsuccessfully as when he attempts to write fine lines. On the other hand, he is far from devoid of a certain dramatic aptitude which must have given to his personages both life and success on the stage.[2]

Minor non-extant comedies of manners.

Several non-extant plays of these years, the titles of which suggest their probable character as comedies of manners, are *A Fault in Friendship*, 1623, recorded as by Brome and Ben Jonson, Junior, who died, a

[1] See Ker's note on this subject in Bullen's *Old Plays, Davenport*, 337–340.

[2] Non-extant plays recorded as Davenport's are *The Fatal Brothers* and *The Politic Queen or Murder will Out*, registered both of them in 1660; and *A Fool and her Maidenhead Soon Parted*, registered in 1663. Doubtless only the last was of comedy type. Davenport collaborated with Thomas Drue, Fleay surmises, *c.* 1622 (i, 105), in *The Woman's Mistaken*, registered in 1653. For *The Bloody Banquet* of these two authors, see above, i, p. 594.

son unworthy his great father, in 1635; *The Crafty Merchant*, by William Bower, licensed in the same year; *The Madcap*, "by Barnes" (perhaps not the Barnabe Barnes, author of *The Devil's Charter*), and *The Way to Content All Ladies or How a Man May Please His Wife*, by Gunnell, both licensed in 1624; *A Fool and Her Maidenhead Soon Parted*, by Davenport, and *The Woman's Mistaken*, by Davenport and Drue, both probably already acted by 1625. A comedy called *The Widow's Prize*, by William Sampson, "which, containing much abusive matter, was allowed by me on condition that my reformations were observed," says Herbert, belongs likewise to this year.[1] A manuscript of this comedy fell victim to the stupid Warburton and his active cook.

Later comedies of Heywood and William Rowley.

Among the older writers who had contributed to the comedy of the time, Heywood, William Rowley, and Jonson survived into the reign of the new king, and Middleton died in the very year of the accession of King Charles. Of Heywood's *Captives* and his *English Traveller*, both of them contributions to the domestic drama, we have already heard.[2] They belong to an older type that still felt the influence of the Roman comedians strong upon them. Heywood's *Lancashire Witches*, 1633, in which he was assisted or revised by Brome, has also claimed the modicum of attention due its mediocre merits.[3] To the same year belonged two lost plays of Heywood and Brome, *The Apprentices' Prize* and *The Life and Death of Sir Martin Skink*, the former of which may have belonged to the general class of comedies discussed in this chapter, while the latter was doubtless of close

[1] Halliwell-Phillipps, *Dictionary*, 272.

[2] Above, i, pp. 337, 352.

[3] Cf. above, i, pp. 363, 364.

kindred. *A Maidenhead Well Lost* is certainly of this class, and an inferior production of offensive plot. The remainder of the later plays of Heywood are unmistakably romantic, an observation equally applicable to the work of William Rowley save for the comedies of manners that he wrote in conjunction with Middleton and the one late comedy, *The New Wonder or a Woman Never Vexed*, published in 1632. It is not impossible, as has been suggested, that this comedy was Rowley's working over of older material originally Heywood's.[1] Whatever the case, *The New Wonder* is an exceptionally pleasing and vigorous example of the older comedy of London life which finds its basis in the biographical particulars of the career of one of the city's worthies. Herein is told the story of Sir Stephen Foster, sometime lord mayor, whom the charitable favor of a compassionate widow took from the counter and selected the partner of her favor and her fortunes. This comedy is memorable not only as a favorable example of the broad, kindly, and virile dramatic stroke of William Rowley, but as the latest specimen of a variety of the drama of London life which was superseded by the more boisterous realism of Brome and Shirley's more refined comedy of fashionable life. Whether *The Knave in Print* and *The Fool without Book*, registered by Moseley as Rowley's with *The Nonesuch* and *Four Honored Loves*, belonged, any of them, to this or other types of drama, must remain beyond discovery.[2]

*The New Wonder*, 1632.

Ben Jonson had been silent to the popular stage since the unsuccessful performance of *The Devil is*

[1] Fleay, ii, 102. For *A Match at Midnight*, believed by some to be in part Rowley's, see above, i, p. 515.

[2] Fleay, ii, 87 and 107.

The last dramas of Jonson:

*an Ass* in the year of the death of Shakespeare. He had been much occupied, as we have seen, meanwhile, with the composition of masques for the court in which, so long as King James lived, he maintained the premier position despite his standing quarrel with Inigo Jones. In 1623 a fire destroyed the library of Jonson, and in it may have perished manuscripts of dramas not only his own.[1] In 1625 Jonson's unfailing patron, the king, died, and in February of the next year was acted for the first time *The Staple of News*. In this comedy is told how old Pennyboy, giving himself out for dead, tests the conduct of his spendthrift son and usurious brother towards the Lady Pecunia, "a rich ward of the mines," forgiving the son in the end for his help in frustrating the villainy of Picklock, a knavish lawyer, and recovering his brother from his usurious distemper. The Lady Pecunia is surrounded by an appropriately named group of abstractions, among them Mortgage, her nurse, Statute and Band, her ladies-in-waiting, and Wax, her chambermaid; and these are provided with a foil in a group of "jeerers," among them Almanac, doctor of physics, Shunfield, a sea-captain, and Madrigal, a poetaster. The Staple of News — doubtless a wild enough flight of the imagination for its day — is an office for the gathering and promulgation of news carried on by one Cymbal and offering abundant opportunity for satire on existing absurdities among newsmongers. The whole office appropriately collapses on the removal of the patronage of the Lady

*The Staple of News*, 1625;

[1] See Fleay, i, 351, who thinks that the dispersion of fragments of Jonson's manuscripts may account for the appearance of Jonsonian bits of dialogue about this time in plays of Fletcher and Middleton.

Pecunia. Suggestion of the general theme of this comedy has been found in the *Plutus* of Aristophanes; and the extravagant scene in which the mad usurer tries his own dogs by form of law is taken from *The Wasps*, while the reported death and disguise of a father to test his son's conduct is paralleled in *The London Prodigal* and in several other comedies.[1] But the personages of Jonson's play, each constructed on a basic characteristic or "humor," the over-ingenious plot, the caustic satirical dialogue, these things, which are the real constituents of the comedy, are characteristically Jonson's own. *The Staple of News* is provided not only with an Induction, but with what the author calls "Intermeans" running between the acts and consisting of a dialogue in commentary on the conduct of the play by personages such as Censure, Mirth, Expectation, and Tattle, here conceived as a bevy of "gentlewomen lady-like attired," seated on the stage, and occupying it during the action. Nothing could have been dearer to the heart of Jonson than such a running comment on the course of his own play. And many of his earlier plays, it will be remembered, provide such comment in various degrees of concealment. On the other hand, nothing could be conceived more absolutely destructive to that illusion of real life which is the end and aim of histrionic art, unless it be the hard and ingenious allegory that stiffens these scenes into a series of groups of automata and carries us back to methods prevailing in medieval drama.

its running satirical comment and allegory.

In *The New Inn or the Light Heart*, "never acted," the title informs us, "but most negligently played

*The New Inn*, 1629.

[1] Koeppel, i, 16, where other "sources" are chronicled. Cf. also, the similar plot of *The City Madam*, above, p. 252.

by some of the King's servants and most squeamishly beheld and censured by others the King's subjects" in 1629, the old poet seems honestly to have tried to escape from the hardening of the old humors into allegory. This comedy in its lost children and disguised parents shows once more the root of Jonson's art in the classics. And although an episode is paralleled in Middleton's comedy, *The Widow*, in which Jonson, as we have seen, was thought to have had a part, the plot in general is Jonson's own invention.[1] Although a somewhat more interesting play than *The Staple*, we cannot feel that "the King's subjects" were far from wrong in their "censure" of *The New Inn*. *The Magnetic Lady or Humors Reconciled* was Jonson's last effort to recover his long-lost popularity on the public stage. This comedy relapses once more into ingenious allegory and is provided with a chorus consisting of an Induction and a series of "Intermeans" in which figure one Damplay, an ignoramus, and a notably clever boy who explains and justifies Jonson's stagecraft at every point. It is from this knowing youth that we learn that "The author beginning his studies of this kind with *Every Man in his Humor;* and after, *Every Man out of his Humor;* and since, continuing in all his plays, especially those of the comic thread, whereof *The New Inn* was the last, some recent humors still, or manners of men, that went along with the times; finding himself now near the close or shutting up of his circle, hath fancied to himself, in idea, this Magnetic Mistress: a lady, a brave bountiful housekeeper, and a virtuous widow; who having a young niece, ripe for man, and marriageable, he makes that his

*The Magnetic Lady*, 1633.

[1] Above, p. 512.

center attractive, to draw thither a diversity of guests, all persons of different humors to make up his perimeter. And this he hath called *Humors Reconciled.*" Thus persistent in his theories was the veteran dramatist to the last. But sadder than the decaying powers and relapses into outworn methods is the bitter and futile personal satire which pervades these later plays. The gibbeting of his arch enemy Inigo had become a fixed idea in the old poet's mind, to which he recurs again and again. Jonson concluded his career as a dramatist with a revision of an older play, *The Tale of a Tub*, acted in 1634, in which, under the character In-and-In Medlay, he delivered his final cut at his foe.[1] There are passages of merit and flashes of the old power in every one of these latest comedies of Jonson. And yet to call them "Jonson's dotages," as did Dryden, is only a harsh way of putting what after all is no less than the truth. Only an honest esteem for the genuine greatness of the Jonson that had been can reconcile even the robustest appetite to a reperusal of these comedies.

Last days of Ben Jonson, 1628–37.

Jonson's return to the popular stage was coincident with his latter days of poverty and disease. Attacked with the palsy and with dropsy, he spent some of these last years bedridden. In 1628 Jonson had succeeded Middleton as chronologer to the city of London, a post to which was attached a yearly stipend of a hundred nobles. Nor was King Charles wholly forgetful of his father's old poet, sending him a gift of a hundred pounds in his sickness of 1629 and later raising his laureate's allowance from a hundred marks to as many pounds. Jonson had been granted a reversion

[1] For a fuller account of this comedy, which seems more wisely regarded an earlier play, see above, i, p. 326.

of the office of Master of the Revels as far back as 1621; but an earlier reversion in favor of Sir John Astley took precedence, and on Astley's death his deputy, Sir Henry Herbert, succeeded to the full emoluments of an office the duties of which he had long exercised, and Jonson was barred. In 1631, too, Jonson lost his post as city chronologer, and his life was embittered by his inveterate quarrel with Inigo Jones. Jonson died August 6, 1637, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. In the following year a collection of thirty elegies appeared, entitled *Jonsonus Virbius*, to which nearly all the leading poets of the day contributed, while in 1640 was published the second collective folio edition of his works.

Jonson's great influence on his immediate contemporaries.

Again and again in these pages has attention been called to the powerful influence of Jonson on the literature of his day. His personal relations extended to nearly every poet of his time, and his example inevitably begot discipleship or active criticism and opposition. No one could remain indifferent to the literary arbiter of the age when that arbiter was neither modest nor silent. Munday and Daniel had for years been the butts of Jonson's ridicule; Dekker and Marston had satirized him and been satirized by him in turn. Chapman, Middleton, and Fletcher—perhaps Shakespeare, too—had written plays with him;[1] Beaumont began by frankly imitating, as did others, Jonson's comedy of humors; while May and Richards as frankly followed Jonson's lead in English tragedy

[1] Cf. *Sejanus*, "To the Reader," where the author speaks of this tragedy as originally written with the aid of "a second pen," and how he has chosen rather "to put weaker" work of his own "than to defraud so happy a genius of his right by my loathed usurpations."

on Roman historical themes. Among the younger wits and poets, several were proud to call themselves the "sons of Ben," as did Herrick and Carew among the lyrists and Randolph and Cartwright among the makers of plays. But though the influence of Jonson was potent through his successes at court on the gentlemen writers, who permitted none other than Jonson to popularize the frigidity of their tragedy and the repetitious classicism of their lighter productions for the popular stage, Jonson was not without a powerful influence on more popular writers as well. Jonson had educated Field, it will be remembered; and now the old broken poet, having nothing to leave his devoted body-servant, Richard Brome, imparted to him some learning and instructed the worthy man in the art of making plays.[1] Three sizable volumes of Brome's dramatic works attest the success of this novel experiment. Brome remained faithfully in service until his master's death, and ever after revered his memory. It was Brome's association with Jonson that made him; but Dekker, too, addressed him familiarly as his "son," and appears to have imparted to him some of his easy humor, although no scruple of Dekker's subtler gift, that of poetry, is discoverable in the verses of Brome.

Richard Brome, died 1653; his earlier work.

A non-extant comedy, entitled *A Fault in Friendship*, licensed in 1623 as "by Brome and young Jonson," marks the earliest trace of the dramatic authorship of Brome.[2] The association is significant.

[1] As to this relationship, see the lines of Jonson, "To my old servant and (by his continued virtue) my loving friend the author of this work, Mr. Richard Brome," prefixed to *The Northern Lass*, printed in 1632. *Works of Brome*, ed. 1873, iii, p. ix.

[2] Other non-extant plays of Brome are *Christianetta*, *The Jewish*

The extant plays of Brome, which are fifteen in number, range in point of time from the late twenties to 1640. Brome is spoken of as dead in 1653 by the publisher of his *Five New Plays*.[1] Brome enjoyed a considerable success in his day, and from an amusing deprecatory self-consciousness which impelled him often to allude to himself in his works, has left us a pleasing image of one who considered himself, when all had been said, something of an intruder in the realms of Parnassus. This attitude is well illustrated in the Prologue to *The Antipodes*, in which, after alluding to the fashion of the moment to run only to such plays as "carry state in scene magnificent and language high, and clothes worth all the rest," Brome claims only an endeavor "to keep the weakest branch o' th' stage alive," and then proceeds to justify the use of "low and homebred subjects," concluding,

> "See yet those glorious plays, and let their sight
> Your admiration move, these your delight." [2]

*The City Wit*, 1629.

Save for a few tragicomedies in which Brome attempts to follow in the wake of Fletcher, works that will claim our later attention, the term "low and homebred" precisely describes the scenes and the personages of Brome.[3] In *The City Wit or Woman Wears the Breeches*, a young citizen almost bankrupt is driven by the ingratitude of so-called friends to seek revenge and the collection of his just debts by trickery and disguise. He impersonates successively a doctor,

*Gentleman*, *The Lovesick Maid*, *Wit in a Madness*, *The Life and Death of Martin Skink*, and *The Apprentices' Prize*. On all of these, see Ward in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, vi, 397.

[1] "To the Readers," signed A. Brome.

[2] *Works* of Brome, iii, 230.

[3] Below, pp. 336–338.

a court messenger, a lame soldier (favorite low comedy figure of the time), and a dancer, and "gulls" his false friends and relations, discovering even in his wife a tendency to go astray. This excessive number of disguises and the *dénouement*, for a parallel to which the reader should compare Chapman's *Beggar of Alexandria*, suggest early work and a study of the preceding drama. The underplot presents several lively characters of low comedy, among them Sneakup's talkative and scolding wife. The plotting is undeniably clever, and the dialogue, as commonly in Brome's comedies, in prose and exceedingly outspoken and coarse. *The New Academy or New Exchange*, of uncertain date, turns on the eccentric conduct of one Matchil, who marries his maid and drives his children out of doors. The "Academy" is a school of dancing, deportment, and worse, which their worthless uncle tries to set up with the daughter and niece of Matchil. An uxorious citizen, intriguing wife, doting mother, and foolish youth, with many more, complete the familiar figures of the scene. In *The Northern Lass*, printed in 1632, Brome rose somewhat above the level of his other work. Constance, the Northern lass (who speaks, by the way, in a species of Yorkshire dialect), has become honestly infatuated with a gentleman named Luckless, who had offered himself, half in jest, to her uncle and in her presence, as a fit husband for her. She follows him to London to find him about to be married to a widow. In the midst of an intricate but exceedingly well-conducted series of intrigues the Northern lass stands forth, natural and pathetic in her constancy, clear-sighted, and absolutely honest. We need not wonder that this comedy, with its lively and often genuinely humorous

*The Northern Lass*, 1632.

dialogue and its happy solution of an apparently impossible situation, was long a favorite and was acted even after the Restoration.

Other comedies of Brome.

*The Novella* departs from the general run of the comedies of Brome in laying its intrigue in Italy and combining two stories which, if not actually of Italian original, at least preserve the atmosphere of *The Palace of Pleasure*. *The Novella*, 1632, is a clever if intricately constructed comedy, even if it rises to no distinction among productions of its class. In *The Weeding of Covent Garden or the Middlesex Justice of the Peace*, of the same year, Brome returned to the more congenial picturing of the city's life about him. Its looseness of structure all but justifies Genest's description of it as a comedy that has no main plot.[1] The "weeding" has allusion to the cleansing of the precinct of disreputable and disorderly characters. A personage named Crosswill, whose "humor" it is to object to everything proposed, attests, as do other personages, Brome's faithfulness to the teaching of Jonson. The similarly named *Sparagus Garden or Tom Hoyden o' Taunton Green* was acted in 1635. Here the situation of Romeo and Juliet is transferred to English middle-class life and the lovers succeed in reconciling their angry fathers, two justices of the peace, by an amusing if shocking device of comedy, which Brome evidently borrowed from *The Heir* of Thomas May.[2] *A Mad Couple Well Matched*, which followed in the next year, reaches depths of coarseness and vulgarity outfathoming the worst passages of Middleton. The hero is an utterly contemptible scamp whose very lecherousness wins him the widow for a wife; "the

*A Mad Couple*, 1636.

[1] Genest, x, 42.

[2] *The Sparagus Garden*, v, xii; *The Heir*, v, i.

mad couple," Sir Valentine Thrivewell, his wife, and his city mistress, Alicia, with the wittol, her husband, are all of them alike shameless. The complaisance and unaffectedness of the immorality of this play lie far lower than the worst of Middleton, and with some other passages of Brome relieve Dryden and Wycherley of the odium of having debased English drama below depths previously reached in the reign of the virtuous King Charles. *The English Moor* has been praised for its elaborate plot and for "a trace of ardor in some of the serious passages." *The Damoiselle or the New Ordinary* contains some "touches of pathos" in the character of the "poor wench Phillis." Both are cleaner plays than *A Mad Couple*, if not abler.[1] In *The Antipodes*, 1638, Brome conceived an original notion and carried it out cleverly. Perigrene has lost his wits by a too attentive study of Mandeville and other writers of travel. To recover them he is taken by his doctor on a supposed journey to the Antipodes, where everything is topsy-turvy: the lawyer refuses his fee, serjeants are besought by a spendthrift gentleman to arrest him, and like absurdities. But Brome appreciated neither the romantic possibilities of such a theme nor, to any subtle degree, the satirical. Latest in point of time, *The Court Beggar*, 1640, in a clever and well-conducted plot, once more turns with kaleidoscopic effect the familiar figures of separated lovers, angry father, scheming widow, and attendant gulls, with the variation of a group of "projectors" conceived and executed with a spirit that the creator of "the ladies collegiate" or "the staple of news" might not have disdained.[2]

*The Antipodes*, 1638.

[1] These comedies date about 1636 to 1638.

[2] Cf. *Epicœne*, and *The Staple of News*.

*A Jovial Crew*, 1641.

One other comedy of Brome demands more than a passing mention. This is *A Jovial Crew or the Merry Beggars*, acted at the Cockpit in 1641. The story turns on a novel idea. Springlove, the *protégé* of Oldrent, a gentleman of fortune, and advanced by him to be his steward, is seized each spring by an uncontrollable desire to return to the gipsy life from which he had been rescued by his benefactor in boyhood. The young daughters of Oldrent and their suitors induce Springlove to let them join him among the gipsies, and several scenes depict the trials and ill-success, especially of the young gentlemen, in their attempts to lead the mendicant life. Meanwhile Amie, daughter of a neighboring Justice, has run away to escape marrying a fool, taking for her protector her father's clerk, who, in his meanness of spirit, deserts her to make his own peace with the Justice. Amie finds protection among the gipsies, and falls in love with Springlove. In the end, by an ingeniously managed play within a play, Springlove turns out to be the true son of Oldrent, and Springlove's uncle the leader of the gipsies, or beggars, as they are called. Some of the figures of this comedy are exceedingly humorous and well drawn. The Justice, who sentences first and then hears reasons for his decision, who will allow no one to speak because neither can hear if both are talking, the shrewd and humorous servant Randall, Oldrent himself and his merry friend Hearty, are in the happiest vein of the Jonsonian comedy of humors and, free from the didacticism of that master if also devoid of his trenchant wit, are closer to life and more simply diverting. With some allowances, it has been truly said of the comedies of Brome that "his view of the world is that of a groom, . . . and the

characters he depicts are drawn from the experience of a flunky. All the coarse and gross and seamy side of human life is shown to us with a prosaic ruthlessness." [1] Brome is readable in doses, not too large, from a certain rude power and an ability to invent situations and dialogues not devoid of a natural if often broad humor; but he wearies and in time disgusts, from the dull level of his art, which neither his clever plots nor his careful workmanship can wholly redeem.

Other dramatical "sons of Ben."

With the advancement of the reign of Charles several new names appear among the "sons of Ben;" for Randolph, Davenant, Marmion, and Cartwright, Nabbes, Mayne, Glapthorne, and Cockayne, even the Earl of Newcastle himself, great name if small playwright, all of these deserve this appellation. Randolph, from the close touch of most of his work with the university, has already been treated;[2] Davenant, from his reach forward into Restoration times, will be deferred for the present.

Shakerley Marmion, 1603–39; his comedies.

Shakerley Marmion was the spendthrift son of a country gentleman, whose estate was already largely dissipated, and friend of clever and riotous Sir John Suckling. Marmion was one of the troop of horse that Sir John raised for King Charles in 1639, at an expense of some £12,000, to repel an invasion of the Scots. But falling ill at York, Marmion died after removal to London, and was thus saved a share in the ridiculous defeat that overtook Sir John's much bruited expedition. Marmion wrote three comedies in the earlier thirties.[3] In *Holland's Leaguer*, 1632, of

[1] J. A. Symonds in the *Academy*, v, 304 (1874).

[2] Cf. above, pp. 85–87.

[3] *The Crafty Merchant or the Soldiered Citizen* is mentioned as

rigidly Jonsonian "humor," the young author rings new changes on the variety of seventeenth century sharper known as a "projector," already familiar to the stage through Jonson's Meercraft in *The Devil is an Ass*,[1] and reproduces such time-honored figures as the braggart soldier (here curiously enough named Autolicus) and the foolish lad and his scheming tutor.[2] In *A Fine Companion*, 1633, a rather better comedy, these figures recur with the inevitable usurer, intriguing girl, and scolding wife; whilst in *The Antiquary*, 1636, a more intricate plot is attempted in a foreign scene, and other stock figures appear: the prince disguised, observant of the conduct of his subjects, the wronged maid masquerading as a page, and the disinherited gallant, the last a figure in all of Marmion's comedies and evidently a projection of the writer's self. The one novel personage in Marmion's repertory is Veterano, the antiquary, though he dwindles into a mere humor before the play concludes. With all their unoriginality, Marmion's plays are not contemptible, but abound in witty speeches and in passages not wanting in eloquence. With Jonson's conception of humors, Marmion caught something of his master's trick of satirical railing, although his best is but a shadow of the English Aristophanes at his average.

William Cartwright's one comedy of manners, *The Ordinary*, 1634, is more purely reminiscent, even to Jonson's thoughts, his personages, and situations.

by Marmion in Warburton's list. It appears to have been written about 1623 for the Lady Elizabeth's players by one William Bowen. Fleay, i, 32.

[1] Cf. also, Brome's use of the projector in *The Court Beggar*, 1640, already noticed.

[2] Cf. especially, Middleton's *Chaste Maid in Cheapside*.

Minor imitators of Jonsonian comedy: William Cartwright, 1611–43.

The "humors" of the group of sharpers of which it treats is absolutely unrelieved in its dullness and coarseness, and is beneath the level of Brome. Cartwright was capable of better work in tragicomedy. He appears to have written nothing for the stage after 1638, but enjoyed a great reputation at Oxford as "the most florid and seraphical preacher in the university." [1] Cartwright died of a malignant fever in 1643. His intimate friend, Jasper Mayne, is likewise the author of a single comedy, *The City Match*, acted at Whitehall by the king's command in 1639 and later at Blackfriars as well. *The City Match* is a vivacious and clever comedy despite its basis in outworn devices. In it two old merchants, mistrusting the reformations of their son and nephew, pretend to embark on a long journey, and returning in disguise with the news of their own deaths, catch the young rascals red-handed in the midst of their revels, and, what is worse, rejoicing at their elders' supposed deaths. From this climax the play reverts to a modification of the motive of *The Silent Woman*, as one of the old merchants determines to cut off the expectations of his nephew by a sudden marriage.[2] Young Plotwell, the scapegrace, is equal to the emergency. He arranges for his uncle a false marriage with a girl to whom he is himself betrothed, and gets a settlement made on her. She turns out a shrew, and is reported as of questionable virtue to her supposed husband, the merchant, who thereupon compounds with his nephew to free

Jasper Mayne, 1604–72.

[1] Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. 1817, iii, 69.

[2] Since noting this resemblance I find a detailed statement of Mayne's specific borrowings from *Epicœne* in Miss Henry's introduction to her recent edition of that comedy, *Yale Studies in English*, xxxi, p. lvii.

him from his bride. There is besides this a variety of other interest. An hilarious scene is that in which a foolish lad, made drunk, is exhibited by his companions, outlandishly decked out to figure a strange fish.[1] *The Amorous War*, Mayne's tragicomedy and only other venture in the drama, will claim our later attention.[2] Mayne rose in the church to the dignity of Archdeacon of Chichester, and is also remembered as the translator of Lucian. Of much the same type are the two comedies of Henry Glapthorne, of whose life next to nothing is known. Glapthorne, too, is more favorably remembered for his ventures in more serious drama.[3] *The Hollander*, acted in 1635 at the Cockpit, is little above the level of Cartwright's *Ordinary*, which it resembles in its group of roarers, here called "the Knights of the Twibil," and in its coarse picture of the life of the city. *Wit in a Constable*, acted four years later, is an abler comedy, and is constructed on a series of tricks involving disguise and much witty dialogue between a pair of gallants and a couple of lively citizens' daughters. The *dénouement* is arranged by Busie, who owes more than his stolen directions to the watch to Dogberry. There is exceedingly good comedy in the scene in which Thorowgood, having put his bookish cousin, Holdfast, up to trying to be a wit, impersonates Holdfast after Holdfast's visit to the uncle of Clare, Thorowgood's beloved, and succeeds in making the old gentleman believe that he is the real Holdfast by his gravity and discourse of books. One of the "tragicomedies" of Glapthorne, *The Lady Mother*, acted at Whitehall in the same year with *The Hollander*

Henry Glapthorne, fl. 1635;

his *Wit in a Constable*, 1639.

[1] *The City Match*, III, ii.

[2] Below, pp. 365, 366.

[3] See p. 345.

(1635), from its English scene and general nature also belongs here. This is a very ambitious and novel play, and involves a serious plot in which Lady Marlowe, conceived as an imperious woman in middle life, covets the happiness of each of her daughters in succession, momentarily wins the lover of each to a confession of love, and, failing in her machinations, urges her son to kill one of the young men in duel. Brought to trial for this supposed crime, her ladyship is so wrought upon by the reported death by drowning of one of her daughters and her lover that she becomes thoroughly contrite, accepts in marriage an old suitor who has remained ever faithful, and has her children restored to her in a masque. Glapthorne has diversified this plot with much light comedy not altogether ineffective in kind, though it cannot be said that he has succeeded in concealing the intrinsic improbability of his serious theme. That any one could find in the wretched, drunken steward of this production "a shameless copy of Malvolio," or a copy of any conceivable kind, is matter as far beyond the comprehension of the present writer as that any one else should discover in Glapthorne's plays "here and there a muskrose or a violet that retains its fragrance."[1] The imagery of Glapthorne has been praised. It is often, if not commonly, strained and over-ingenious. Glapthorne tried hard; his success is at best mediocre.

Thomas Nabbes, fl. 1632–40.

In the comedies of Thomas Nabbes we meet much fresher and stronger work. Nabbes was a Worcester man, apparently in the service of a nobleman in that neighborhood. Besides plays, he wrote some other

[1] Ward, iii, 154; Bullen, *Old English Plays*, ii, 101. Cf. as to subject, Shirley's *Constant Maid*.

poetry, and we have already heard of his "moral," *Microcosmus*, among the masques, and of his classical tragedy of *Hannibal and Scipio* elsewhere.[1] Nabbes wrote three comedies of London manners between 1632 and 1638, all of which appear to have been acted. *Covent Garden*, 1632, is a slight affair, but its unpretentious figures, especially those of the lovers, young Artlove and Dorothy Worthy, mark a return for subject-matter to life as opposed to the eternal repetitions of the figures of Jonson and Middleton. The other comedies are even better. *Tottenham Court*, 1633, opens with a promising elopement in which the young couple are separated in the dark, and the lady, Bellamie, is driven to seek the protection of a milkmaid. The plot later descends to a more common type of the comedy of intrigue, though several ingenious changes are worked into the old situation of a modest maid innocently lodged in a brothel; and the *dénouement*, with a lost inheritance restored and the milkmaid discovered to be a lady, is of the approved stuff of old story. But it is in *The Bride*, 1638, that Nabbes has offered his best and most original contribution to the comedy of his time. The play turns on the elopement of a bride on the eve of her wedding to an elderly gentleman, Goodlove, with his supposed foster son, Theophilus. The young people, who are both honorable and virtuous, would have been unequal to such a deed, fondly as they love each other, but for the promptings of one Raven, a cousin of Goodlove, and, should Theophilus be discarded, Goodlove's heir. Goodlove proves magnanimous, and the whole action hinges on Raven's tactics to keep the runaways from returning home to obtain forgiveness. A novel and

*The Bride*, 1638.

[1] Above, pp. 45, 46, 137.

successful scene is that in which the young runaways struggle with their sense of duty and gratitude, and determine, although already compromised, to seek reconciliation with Goodlove, even at the risk of lasting separation.[1] Nabbes has been justly praised for "his modest, well-conducted girls" and "his virtuous and refined young men." The cleanliness of Nabbes in an age in which coarseness and obscenity seem to have been regarded necessary ingredients in every comic scene is as refreshing as is his freedom from pedantry and fine writing, darling sins of most of the sons of Ben. Nabbes, although not poetical, has an ease and a freedom of style and a certain power of quick and at times dramatic action that place him well above the average of his lesser contemporaries.

Sir Aston Cockayne, 1608–84.

Although perhaps not unmistakably a "son of Ben," it seems most convenient to treat here Sir Aston Cockayne, a gentleman of wealth and station, holding degrees of both universities and much traveled abroad. Cockayne is the author of two plays which fall, in all likelihood, before the closing of the theaters. The one, *Trapolin Supposed a Prince*, is an adaptation of an Italian comedy and clever in its trivial way; *The Obstinate Lady* is an original effort.[2] This comedy is very ambitiously plotted and rises at times to melodramatic situations. It offers an interesting example of that want of touch with actual life that came to characterize many later comedies; for although the scene is laid in London, the personages retain the outlandish names customarily employed in the tragi-

[1] *The Bride*, II, iii.

[2] I should date *The Obstinate Lady* 1638 or 1639, from the plain allusion to Brome's *Antipodes* of the former date. *Trapolin* was translated before 1640.

comedies and romances of the time. *The Obstinate Lady* is elaborately stilted and grandiloquent in its diction in parts. On the other hand, it is not without its own slender merits. Lorice is a capital fantastic wooer, and his account of his travels in the antipodes (with which should be compared Jack Freshwater in Shirley's *Ball* and Brome's comedy, *The Antipodes*), is diverting nonsense.[1] Cockayne is of course imitative. Carionel and Lucora repeat, as Langbaine long since pointed out, the situations of the Prince of Tarent and Almira in Massinger's *A Very Woman;*[2] whilst the amusing scene in which a lover, pretending to be dead, is rated for his unworthiness by his mistress who knows that he is feigning recalls a clever scene of Fletcher's *Tamer Tamed*.[3]

The Duke of Newcastle, 1592–1676;

Lastly among the followers of Jonson in comedy must be included William Cavendish, Duke of Newcastle, who, with his duchess of equally literary proclivities, was the generous patron of several poets both before and after the Restoration. Newcastle was the author of certain treatises on horsemanship and fencing, for which Jonson had praised him; and the then earl had extended his fostering hand to the decaying poet and helped sustain him among the disappointments of his later years.[4] Indeed, the duchess' report of her husband's opinion, that he had "never heard any read well but Jonson," opens to our surmise a pleasant picture of the relations of the young

[1] *Works of Cockayne*, ed. 1874, p. 42.

[2] Langbaine, 69. *Ovid's Tragedy*, Cockayne's one attempt at more serious drama, falls without our period. For his *Masque at Bretbie*, see above, p. 134.

[3] Act v, scene iv; and cf. Shirley, *The Witty Fair One*, v, iii.

[4] *Underwoods*, Gifford-Cunningham, *Jonson*, viii, 427; ix, 15, 324.

and noble aspirant to literary honors and the veteran dramatist.[1] Shirley later enjoyed the friendship and patronage of Newcastle and is said to have followed him in his unsuccessful military campaigns which terminated in 1644. Apparently but two of the four comedies attributed to his grace by Genest belong to a period preceding the closing of the theaters.[2] These are *The Country Captain* and *The Variety*, which usually appear together in a rare little volume printed in 1649. *The Variety* is a true comedy of its type, showing mixed influences of Jonson and Shirley. To the former belongs the assemblage or club of ladies, addressed by Mistress Voluble on the absorbing topics, dress and cosmetics, a scene of some humor, and the "Jeerers, Major and Minor."[3] Shirley's influence is more general in the direct conduct of the plot and the easier dialogue; while such time-honored figures as the widow, the country clown (here defined in the Jonsonian word "chiause"),[4] the stupid constable, and rascally Justice recur with a sufficient variation not too completely to belie the title of the comedy. *The Country Captain* seems the maturer play. It was reprinted by Bullen in 1882 from a manuscript in the British Museum under Halliwell's title, *Captain Underwit*, and with a hasty ascription of its authorship to Shirley, although this last may not be so wide of the mark in view of the assertion of Wood that Shirley assisted his noble patron in "the composure of certain plays."[5] *The*

his comedies.

[1] *Letters of the Duchess of Newcastle*, quoted by Ward, ii, 321.

[2] Genest, x, 73, 74.

[3] *The Variety*, II, i, ed. 1649, p. 13.

[4] Cf. *The Alchemist*, I, ii, 26.

[5] *Harl. MS.* 7650; Bullen, *Old English Plays*, ii, 321; see Fleay, i, 48–49; and *Athenæ Oxonienses*, iii, 739.

*Country Captain* is far from a contemptible performance, and its lively scenes of contemporary English country life must have proved readily actable by the King's company at Blackfriars. Besides the dangerous intrigue of Sir Francis with Lady Hartwell and the courting of her sister by several suitors, we have the fresh humors of Underwit, captain of the "trained band," or militia as we should now call it, conceived in a manner and carried out with a success by no means unworthy of either of the noble author's great sponsors. Internal evidence goes to prove that *The Country Captain* was acted in or about the year 1639. *The Variety* may have shortly preceded it. The dramatic work of the Duke of Newcastle deserves neither the encomium of his lady, who considered him with pardonable wifely enthusiasm "the best lyric and dramatic poet of his age," nor yet the obloquy of Pepys, who found *The Country Captain* "the first [play] that ever I was weary of in my life." [1]

James Shirley, 1596–1666;

James Shirley was born in London in September, 1596, and educated at the Merchant Tailors' School, at St. John's College, Oxford, and at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, taking his final degrees in 1619, and entering into holy orders soon after. On his conversion to the Roman faith in the early twenties, Shirley held for a year or two the mastership of St. Alban's grammar school, but by 1625 we find him living in Gray's Inn and, as Wood puts it, "set up for a play maker." [2] Shirley had already made his first venture into authorship in an erotic narrative

[1] *Life of Newcastle*, ed. C. H. Firth, 1886, pp. 201, 202; *Diary of Pepys*, ed. Wheatley, ii, 126.

[2] *Athenæ Oxonienses*, iii, 737.

poem, afterwards entitled *Narcissus*, and, when no more than a bachelor of arts, had celebrated in verse the obsequies of Queen Anne.[1] From the year of the accession of Charles onward Shirley continued an active professional dramatist, writing, up to 1636, almost wholly for the Queen's men, who were playing at the Phœnix and later at the Cockpit, and gradually gaining the voice and patronage of the court and the king until he succeeded, without dissent, to the popularity of Fletcher. Shirley seems to have been an estimable man, living on terms of easy familiarity with many gentlemen of rank, and personally esteemed by King Charles and his queen, Henrietta Maria. It was the king himself, according to Sir Henry Herbert, Master of the Revels, who suggested to Shirley the plot for one of his most successful plays, *The Gamester*;[2] and it was into the hands of Shirley that the four societies of the inns of court intrusted the preparation of the splendid masque of 1634, *The Triumph of Peace*, which was presented alike as a refutation of the outrageous attacks of Prynne on both the queen and the drama and to emphasize the Templars' outburst of personal loyalty to a sovereign who, whatever his political shortcomings, was much beloved by those who were nearest to him.[3]

his activity as a playwright.

In 1636 the London theaters were closed for many months by reason of the prevalence of the plague; and Shirley was therefore the more readily induced by one of his patrons, the Earl of Kildare, to visit Ireland in order to write for the new theater recently

Shirley in Ireland;

[1] Gifford-Dyce, *Shirley*, vi, 463, 514.

[2] Herbert's Register, Malone, *Shakespeare*, iii, 236.

[3] See above, pp. 131, 132.

established in Dublin. At least four, if not a larger number, of Shirley's plays were written for the Irish stage; [1] though he seems to have maintained dramatic relations at home until his final return to London in 1640. With the closing of the theaters by Parliament in 1642, Shirley's activity as a playwright came to an end. He appears to have taken some part, as we have seen, in the unsuccessful campaigns of his patron, the Earl of Newcastle; but before long he returned to his early profession of schoolmaster and combined with it the writing of a *Via Latina* and an English Grammar. In 1646 Shirley gathered his poems into a volume; and in the following year edited the first folio of the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher. Towards the close of his life Shirley drudged as a literary hack and translator for John Ogilby, translator of Homer and Vergil, and Ogilby forgot to acknowledge his assistance. Shirley with his wife was driven out of his home in Whitefriars by the great fire in 1666 and survived only two months, his wife dying on the same day, "being in a manner," says Wood, "overcome with affrightments, disconsolations, and other miseries occasioned by that fire and their losses." [2]

his later career.

Shirely's comedies of London life.

Ten of the dramas of Shirley are comedies of London life, albeit the earliest of these, *Love Tricks or the School of Compliment*, mentions no scene except "our fairy isle" and clothes its familiar types—the old man

[1] These are *The Royal Master*, *St. Patrick for Ireland*, *The Constant Maid*, and *The Doubtful Heir* first produced under title *Rosania or Love's Victory*. See Ward, iii, 91. Fleay would add to the Irish plays of Shirley, *The Politician* and *The Gentleman of Venice*.

[2] *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ii, 740.

who would marry, the lover who loses his wits, the silly lad, and the lame soldier — in the obscurity of Italian names. This production, which must have been acted in 1625 before the death of King James, is a composite of a comedy of manners, a tragicomedy, and a pastoral. It owes at least one situation, that of the maidens disguised as shepherdesses, to *As You Like It*, the coward's challenge suggests *Twelfth Night*, and the mock duel and "school of compliment" are pure Jonson.[1] In short, *Love Tricks* is precisely the imitative production which we might expect of a clever young man, well read in the drama that had preceded him but as yet unmoved by the mainspring of original invention. In *The Wedding*, which followed in the next year, Shirley struck for the first time his pace in comedy. The play turns on the separation of a couple, about to be married, by a charge of unchastity in the bride, actually believed to be true by Marwood, the cousin and friend of the bridegroom who makes it, but disproved after the duel, which the situation demanded according to the manners of the time, and shown to have been the result of a plot on Marwood's credulity and the outcome of his dissolute pursuit of pleasure in very different quarters. The scenes between Beauford, the wronged lover, and Marwood afford abundant opportunity for strong dramatic situation, and the conversion of the profligate Marwood to an honest man, willing to do restitution for the wrong he has done, is finely conceived. The lighter element is com-

*The Wedding*, 1626.

[1] *Love Tricks*, IV and V; *As You Like It*, II, iv, and thereafter. See "the Ladies Collegiate" of *The Silent Woman* and "the Staple of News" in the comedy of that title; and note the recurrence of this Jonsonian device of a group of "irregular humorists" in *The Ordinary*, *Holland's Leaguer*, *The Damoiselle*, and *The Hollander*.

bined with this serious plot in a series of scenes gathering about the humors of Rawbones, a happy variation on the eternal usurer in his economy of appetite, and in his employment, in his courtship, of a legal jargon like that of Ignoramus. This comedy is especially clever in its novel use of old material, and in the effective plotting by which each scene ends with an appropriate climax; and the greater ease, power, and naturalness of the true dramatist is at once apparent in a comparison with the group of bookish Jonsonians who have just claimed our consideration.[1] In his next comedy, *The Brothers*, acted in 1626, Shirley turned to that favorite quarry of Fletcher and Massinger, Spanish story, and worked over once more the familiar theme of the tyrannical father who, in his eagerness to have his daughter marry riches, passes her from suitor to suitor only to be duped in the end. The play is purely a comedy of English manners, although the scene is laid in Madrid. It is impossible to follow Fleay in the nice distinctions by which he transfers the title, *The Brothers*, to the anonymous *Dick of Devonshire*, and identifies Shirley's play before us with *The Politic Father*, licensed for the King's men in 1641.[2]

*The Brothers*, 1626.

In *The Witty Fair One* we have a model of its type, for its novel and inventive plotting (which none the less transcends very little the possible course of events) and for its fresh and clever use of old and favorite material in both situation and personage. The plot turns on a contest between Violetta, the ingenious "fair

*The Witty Fair One*, licensed 1628, its constructive ingenuity.

[1] This comedy, with some others of Shirley, has been referred by Stiefel in *Romanische Forschungen*, v, 196, to a Spanish source, but that source is not named.

[2] Fleay, ii, 236, 246.

one," who is betrothed against her will to the foolish knight, Sir Nicholas Treedle, and an elderly and knowing servant, called Brain (in reminiscence of Jonson's Brainworm), set by Violetta's father to watch and outwit her in her endeavors to favor the suit of her lover, Aimwell. Seldom in the old drama has the principle of climax and surprise been so cleverly employed as in this comedy. Thus, Violetta has sent a message to Aimwell discouraging his suit. The first act ends with Aimwell's favorable interpretation of this message, an interpretation which the witty fair one purposed. The second act concludes with the conveyance of a letter by Sensible, Violetta's maid, into Aimwell's hand. But Brain has observed it. The climax is not, as might be expected, a frustration of Violetta's purpose by Brain, nor yet a temporary triumph of the lovers. Sensible has returned Aimwell's own letter to him instead of her lady's missive; and Aimwell is dashed in an instant from anticipated bliss to the misery of disappointment which this apparent scorn of his suit signifies to him. Moreover, Brain has purloined and given to her father the letter in which Violetta had accepted the proffered love of Aimwell. Brain now triumphs. Sensible is dismissed from her lady's service, and Brain himself is to "man" Violetta, by her father's orders, in all her walks abroad until she is safely married to foolish Sir Nicholas. But our "witty" lady now employs another device: the Tutor of Sir Nicholas has made advances to her; she encourages him and bids him assault Brain for her sake as she is walking with him near the Exchange, masked as was the custom with ladies on the street in her day. This the Tutor does; Brain beats him, and Sensible, who has followed, dressed like her mistress,

takes her place while Violetta escapes to her waiting Aimwell. But Brain's humiliation is not yet complete: the Tutor returns with Serjeants and Brain is haled off to answer a charge of assault and battery at the end of act fourth. In the last act Sir Nicholas meets his recreant Tutor with Sensible, the supposed Violetta, rescues her and marries her in her mask; and the comedy ends with the return of the runaways, Aimwell and Violetta, married, and with the discovery of the supposed Violetta, now Lady Treedle. An interesting underplot in which Fowler, an avowed libertine, is won to reformation and matrimony by means, originally daring if *risqué* even in this age of dramatic unrestraint, is equally well conducted, but is not allowed to usurp an undue share of the auditors' attention.

Shirley's comedies of 1632: *The Changes;*

To the year 1632 belong three excellent comedies of Shirley. *The Changes or Love in a Maze* tells with buoyant spirit the cross purposes of three pairs of lovers. Gerard cannot decide between two sisters, both in love with him; Thorney is diverted from one lady to another, but returns to his earlier love; Youngrave wins by his generosity, not the lady on whom he first set his heart, but another. Sir Gervais Simple, the foolish young knight, is an agreeable variation of an old figure; his gulling by a page disguised as a girl and marriage to him is a novel use of an old device; whilst Caperwit, the poetaster, is a lively fool of a new type. In *Hyde Park* and *The Ball* we have closer and more realistic pictures of contemporary manners. Here Shirley is more than a bookish dramatist, and draws his figures, dialogue, and episodes direct from the fashionable life of his day. *Hyde Park* centers in the races (apparently of men as well as horses),

*Hyde Park;*

which society attended in the then rural Hyde Park. Carol is an excellent example of the sprightly, witty, virtuous, but free-spoken young woman of fashion. She and her lover, Fairfield, conduct their courtship by the process of a trial of wit and become each other's by right of mutual conquest. Nor are the scenes in which a husband, returned incognito, is forced by his intending successor to dance at his wife's marriage and in which the husband forces his would-be successor to dance alone, less diverting in their more farcical way. *The Ball* turns attention to the fashionable assemblies for public dancing. The word "ball" was then new, and these meetings were surmised by scandal-mongers to be a cloak for vice. "The main purpose of this comedy," says Ward, "seems to have been to give the lie to the scandalous reports which had arisen in connection with the first attempts to establish subscription balls." [1] But there was more than this in the play. For Herbert adds to his license of this comedy in November, 1632: "In the play *The Ball* written by Shirley and acted by the Queen's players there were divers personated so naturally, both of lords and others of the court, that I took it ill and would have forbidden the play but that Beeston promised many things, which I found fault withal, should be left out." [2] In the same passage Herbert observes that a poet who so offends "deserves to be punished, and the first that offends in this kind of poets or players shall be sure of public punishment." Shirley was careful not to offend so again. When this play was printed, in 1639, the title contained the words, "written by George Chapman and James

*The Ball.*

[1] Ward, iii, 107 and note.

[2] Herbert's Register, Malone, *Shakespeare*, iii, 231.

The alleged collaboration of Shirley with Chapman.

Shirley." We have already found these names in juxtaposition on the title of the historical tragedy, *Chabot, Admiral of France*, printed in the same year.[1] What may have been the relations of the two poets in 1632 it would be difficult to say. Chapman was now seventy-three years of age, and had yet two years to live in the arduous and protracted poverty which was the affliction of his life. Shirley was thirty-six, at the height of his popularity at court, and happy in the personal patronage of his sovereign. It is pleasant to think that in making over old material the most successful dramatist of his day should have coupled his name with that of the aged translator of Homer; for that Shirley should have collaborated with Chapman at so late a date in a manner otherwise than in the revision of old material seems impossible in view of the fact that Chapman cannot be shown to have had a share in any other plays than these subsequent to the death of Shakespeare. As to *The Ball*, it is difficult to discover anything of Chapman in it, or to follow Koeppel as to the hints which he supposes furnished by Jonson's Puntavolo for Jack Freshwater, the traveler, or by Fletcher's Lapet for the coward Bostwick.[2]

*The Gamester*, 1633; its fortuitous prominence.

*The Gamester*, acted 1633, is conspicuous among the comedies of Shirley from the circumstance that King Charles, through Herbert, had suggested to the poet his plot, and on seeing it acted declared that "it was the best play he had seen for seven years."[3]

[1] Above, i, pp. 420, 421.

[2] But see Fleay, i, 238; Koeppel, ii, 69, 70.

[3] Herbert's Register, Malone, *Shakespeare*, iii, 236. Part of the plot, Langbaine, 479, informs us, is to be found in the *Ducento Novelle* of Celio Malespini, Part II, novel 96, and in the eighth story of Margaret of Navarre.

Owing to this fortuitous prominence, *The Gamester* has attracted more than one attack, to which the radical immorality of the story and a coarseness of speech, beyond even the average of its outspoken age, have rendered it only too justly liable. But the popularity of *The Gamester*, both in Shirley's time and on its revivals by Garrick and Poole in 1757, 1772, and 1827, is based not solely on its appeal to the pruriency of its auditors, but likewise on the admirable knitting of its plot and the success with which the dramatic suspense is sustained to the very end. Wilding is a contemptible brute; Hazard, the gamester, a colorless gallant, save for his reputed bravery. And the women of the play, albeit virtuous according to the letter of that word, are tainted by their associations. We may assuredly agree that the ideals of Puritanism, like all other ideals of decent living, must stand antithetical to the realities of such life, and wonder with Kingsley that a virtuous monarch should have chosen such a subject and then have praised it.[1] And yet it cannot be said that Shirley, in painting for us this picture of the profligacy and sensuality of his age, has sought to render vice attractive, to justify it or in any wise extenuate its grossness. To pick and choose this play as typical of the comedy of its age, and of Shirley in particular, is almost as unfair as it would be to select the discourse of Mistress Overdone and her tapster Pompey as characteristic of Shakespeare's dialogue at large, or hold up the device by which Helena wins her husband, Bertram — a device by the way not altogether dissimilar to that employed by Mistress Wilding

Injustice of regarding this play as typical of Shirley and his age.

[1] See Charles Kingsley, *Plays and Puritans* (1873), ed. 1889, pp. 57–61; and also Gardiner, *History of England*, vii, 331.

under similar conditions — as typical of the master dramatist's prevalent ethics of conduct.

*The Example, The Lady of Pleasure, The Constant Maid,* 1634–39.

With *The Example*, 1634, *The Lady of Pleasure*, 1635, and *The Constant Maid*, probably first acted in Ireland between 1636 and 1639, we complete the tale of Shirley's comedies of London life. The plays of Shirley into which romantic elements enter to a controlling degree must claim our later attention.[1] *The Example* is a serious drama turning upon the regeneration of Fitzavarice, a profligate lord, by the simple steadfastness of Mistress Perigrene, a true wife.[2] The fine punctilio by which his lordship insists on meeting Captain Perigrene in duel to satisfy the honor of both, after he has released the Captain's debts to him and freed him from prison (whither he had been dragged by the officious zeal of one of his lordship's creatures), might have afforded Kingsley and other detractors of Shirley a more honorable and a no less faithful picture of the manners of the times. *The Lady of Pleasure* is, once more, an admirable specimen of its class. Lady Bornwell has become addicted to the pleasures of social life; her husband cures her by pretending to follow similar courses. In an underplot the author repeats in new guise the story of the regeneration of a noble *roué* by the wit and charm of a virtuous woman. Celestina, a widow, young, beautiful, and rich, is a very engaging figure, though her anticipated marriage with her reformed suitor is not a part of the conclusion of the play. Lastly we have *The Constant Maid or Love Will Find Out the Way*, a play of more careless construc-

[1] Cf. below, pp. 312–326.

[2] This play has also been declared of Spanish origin; see above, p. 288.

tion and more corrupt text than is usual with Shirley. The plot turns upon the unpleasing situations of a daughter and mother, rivals for the love of the same man, and shows a reversion to many of the commoner types of Middletonian comedy. A novel feature for a play of this class is the impersonation of the King by one of the characters for the purpose of fooling the usurer Hornet, a scene which, like others by Shirley, may have been calculated for the meridian of Dublin, and could scarcely have been allowed by Herbert on the London stage.[1]

Shirley's later comedies of manners, while favorable examples in scene after scene of that dramatic aptitude which he shares in full measure with his peers, are less artificially and consummately plotted than his earlier work. They seem closer to real life and more suggestive of a portraiture of actual personages and occurrences. Shirley's power as a writer of comedies of realistic type lies in these stage pictures of the higher grades of the social life about him. These he treats in the gay spirit of a participant rather than with the phlegm of satirical caricature. Yet while Shirley's figures are measurably true to life, they often fall into the well-worn grooves of type, repeating, albeit with happy variations, the personages of Middleton and Fletcher which seem unwearyingly to have amused the theater-goers of the time. The foolish youth, often a knight newly come into his estate, like Sir Nicholas Treedle, or Sir Gervais Simple, is a Middletonian figure, like the sundry kinds of gulls, and "humorous" suitors,

Shirley's eminence in comedies of contemporary life;

his types in character;

[1] *The Constant Maid*, III, ii. A certain similarity in the main situation between this comedy and Glapthorne's *Lady Mother*, which may have preceded it a year or two, has already been noticed.

Lord Rainbow, Sir William Scentlove, Alexander Kickshaw, and Confident Rapture, and the inevitable "usurers," Woodhamore, Barnacle, and Hornet. Fletcherian are "the merry, resourceful maiden," Violetta, Carol, or Celestina, though Shirley loves to present them to us in twos (as in *The Witty Fair One*), or even in threes (as in *The Ball*), thus to increase the vivacity of his scene. Prime favorite with Shirley, as with most of his predecessors, is "the wild young gentleman." Such is Fowler in the underplot of *The Witty Fair One*, reclaimed and won to virtue, or at least to marriage, by the outrageous stratagem of Penelope, such is Marwood in *The Wedding*, of whom we have heard above, and the three pleasure-loving lords of *Hyde Park*, *The Example*, and *The Lady of Pleasure*. Indeed, we may set down the conversion of a libertine, won to virtue in the pursuit of pleasure by the steadfastness or cleverness of his intended victim as Shirley's favorite situation in this form of comedy, for it enters into at least five of these plays.[1] As to the style and conduct of his comedies, Shirley has more grace, if not more vivacity, than Middleton, and he is free from the mannerisms of Fletcher's verse and phrase. Shirley falls neither into Massinger's tendency towards rhetorical and inflated language, nor into Jonson's didactic attitude and objective morality. In a word, the best of Shirley's comedies of manners, like those of Massinger, unite in happy combination Middleton's power to translate into dramatic terms the contemporary life of London with a restraint and care in constructive detail which is distinctive of the comedies of Jonson. Shirley is always natural and adequate of phrase. He

his favorite situation;

his dramatic adequacy.

[1] Cf. also, the underplot of *Love's Cruelty*.

is a sure master of eloquence where eloquence belongs; and we shall find him equally capable, in his romantic work, of the imaginative portrayal of poetical emotion.

John Ford in comedy.

Of John Ford, one of the truly great names in the annals of English dramatic literature, we have already heard as the author of the excellent historical drama, *Perkin Warbeck*.[1] We have also met with Ford in collaboration with Dekker in that painfully effective and pathetic tragedy, *The Witch of Edmonton*, and in the exquisite masquelike production known as *The Sun's Darling*.[2] Ford's distinctive work in the domain of tragedy and his striking share in the disintegration of the old drama belong to the next chapter.[3] Suffice it here to note that Ford has left no single play which belongs wholly to the comedy of manners, although abundance of intrigue and an overplus of intolerable foolery mark *The Fancies*, while *The Lady's Trial* touches in its more serious plot the skirts of romantic domestic drama.

*The Fancies Chaste and Noble*, c. 1635.

*The Fancies Chaste and Noble* was acted by the Queen's players at the Phœnix, and therefore before May, 1636; a clear gird at Shirley's *Gamester* in the prologue may place it a year or two earlier.[4] Ford's comedy is a deliberate and cynical appeal to the pruriency of his auditors. "The fancies" are three young women living in the court of Octavio, Marquis of Siena, described as a bachelor. They are in charge of a coarse-spoken matron, Morosa, who is sur-

[1] Above, i, p. 305.

[2] For these plays, see above, i, pp. 362, 363, and ii, 137.

[3] Below, pp. 327–336.

[4] Cf. the words, "Nor . . . is brought in a thriving gamester, that doth chance to win a lusty sum," etc.

rounded by a group of foul-mouthed figures of low comedy. A post of honor in the court has been found for one Livio, friend of a nephew of the Marquis, and it is suggested to him that in return he send his fair sister, Castemela, to court as a companion to "the fancies," whilst it is foully insinuated that she can come to no actual harm at the hands of the Marquis for the best of conceivable reasons. When the author has thus deliberately debased his scene, he lays each of the disgusting ghosts of his own raising by explaining that "the fancies" are the good Octavio's nieces, and that Castamela has merely been brought to court to further a design of the Marquis' nephew to separate the lady from her lover and marry her himself, a consummation which the precious scoundrel is permitted to compass. The underplot of Flavia, divorced by a worthless husband and married, or rather sold, to a rich lord is based on the same ruse. Flavia appears a wanton, but our expectation of her wickedness is foiled, and the author, tongue in cheek, leers at us for falling victims to his malign art; for art there is in this strange comedy, the insinuating art of a Sterne, tempering as frank a brutality as that of Brome or of Wycherley. Here, as elsewhere, Ford is extremely solicitous to be thought original; and yet it is notable that he remains tethered to the old conventions of the corrupt life of the petty Italian court of the Renaissance, and only twangs an old string with a stronger hand.

*The Lady's Trial*, 1638.

*The Lady's Trial*, licensed in May, 1638, and acted at the Cockpit, is believed to be the latest of Ford's plays, and is a comedy of genuine excellence, power, and literary worth. Auria, a noble Genoese, is called to service against the Turk. He leaves Spinella, his

fair young wife, to the protection of his dearest friend, Aurelio, a grave, suspicious, but loyal man, who, during a party at Lord Adorni's house, surprises his lordship and Spinella under compromising circumstances. Spinella is guiltless, but hearing of her husband's early return home and fearing his displeasure, leaves his house. Auria returns and is confronted with Aurelio, whose zeal in friendship is open to question as officious; with Adorni, who comes to bear witness to Spinella's steadfastness and offer honorable satisfaction for his wrong act; and finally with Spinella, who returns, recovered from her temporary panic, yearning for her husband's love and protection, yet fearful of his displeasure. It is with the moods and passions which flicker about this surcharged situation that Ford plays in several scenes with a grasp and emotional subtlety unparalleled by any other dramatic poet. Even the minor characters, the gloomy lover, Malfato, the light-o'-love, Levedolche, and the two ridiculous suitors, Guzman and Fulgoso, are drawn with a decision and distinctness which is the more pleasing that even the low-comedy parts are free from the coarseness and uncleanliness that commonly disfigures the comic personages of Ford.

The early comedies of Davenant;

As we draw towards the end of our period, several young writers appear whose labors for the stage were to be resumed with the restoration of King Charles. It was to William Davenant and Thomas Killigrew that the new king was to issue a patent in 1660, granting them the right to "create" two companies of players; and both were playwrights of accredited success before the ordinance of Parliament closed the theaters eighteen years before.[1] In pre-Restora-

[1] As to Davenant, cf. pp. 299–344; as to Killigrew, p. 302.

tion times Davenant and Killigrew figure more conspicuously as writers of tragicomedy than in the less ambitious comedy of every-day life. And yet their comedies of manners which date from these earlier days are important, if not for their intrinsic excellence, for the clear indications which they afford us of the trend of later Stuart drama. The scene of *The Just Italian*, 1629, Davenant's earliest venture in the comedy of manners, is laid in Florence, but the play, despite some high-flown language and an apparent gravity in parts, is purely of the type. This comedy is compactly planned and well worked out, and turns in chief on Altamont, the just Italian's, difficulty with his extravagant and high-born wife and the generous treatment by means of which he succeeds in the end in reclaiming her. Davenant's next comedy was *The Wits*, acted in 1634, which enjoyed in its day an unusual popularity. The plot turns on the ambition of a couple of foolish country gentlemen, the elder Palatine and Sir Morglay Thwack, to live by their wits in London, and details how both they and Sir Tyrant Thrift, guardian of the heroine, are robbed and misused by the younger Palatine, a typical specimen of that old favorite, the clever unthrift. Davenant's dialogue is well written and often very sprightly. His plot is lively and inventive if improbable, and vindicates to the full "the claims of town gallantry to a monopoly of the art" of living by one's wits. It was of this play that Herbert records with unconscious humor a difference of opinion between his master, King Charles I, and his pragmatic self. Herbert had gone over Davenant's comedy with censorious scrutiny, and, troubled not a whit at the breadth of a situation in one scene "which

*The Wits*, 1634.

would have suited," as Ward puts it, "the most frolic pages of Boccaccio," had carefully expunged certain strengthening words with which, after the fashion of their kind, the gallants of the play had seasoned their conversation.[1] His majesty ordered these words restored to the text, and Herbert obeyed, noting his obedience in the following wise: "The king is pleased to take 'faith,' 'death,' 'slight,' for asseverations and no oaths, to which I humbly submit as my master's judgment; but under favor conceive them to be oaths, and enter them here to declare my opinion and submission." [2] Davenant's other early comedy of manners was licensed in August, 1635, under the title, *News from Plymouth.* It has been regarded as the alteration of an earlier play, the work of one superior to the young Davenant in the practice of the dramatic art; but little remains to uphold such a surmise or to disclose the identity of Davenant's supposed predecessor.[3] *News from Plymouth* offers the reader the somewhat novel situation of three young officers in the royal navy stayed for wind in Plymouth harbor, with their adventures ashore with gentle and other women. The subject demanded little more than a string of scenes sustained by animated dialogue, and this Davenant was abundantly able to supply. Here more closely, too, than elsewhere does Davenant seem to follow the models of Jonsonian "humor," in such personages, for example, as the talkative old knight, Sir Solemn Trifle, whose important news from the continent would do credit to Jonson's own *Staple of*

*News from Plymouth,* 1635.

[1] Ward, iii, 172.
[2] Herbert's Register, Malone, *Shakespeare,* iii, 235.
[3] Fleay, i, 102.

*News*, or in Sir Furious Inland, whose belligerency stretches even the generous bounds of caricature.[1]

Thomas Killigrew: *The Parson's Wedding*, 1635.

Thomas Killigrew's one comedy of manners in pre-Restoration times is *The Parson's Wedding*. It was written at Basle, while that worthy and companion of princes was on the grand tour in 1635, and acted in 1640 at Blackfriars by the King's men. The plot concerns the overreaching of a parson by a "witty" captain, who marries him to his discarded mistress, and with the aid of other gallants reduces his victim to the most contemptible situation in which a man so circumstanced can be conceived to exist. *The Parson's Wedding* is unparalleled for the unblushing effrontery of its situations, both suggested and portrayed, and for the intolerable ribaldry and obscenity of its dialogue, which the wit and verbal dexterity of its author cannot for an instant redeem. It cannot but add to the horror which every lover of the drama must feel at the sight of such a prostitution of art to learn that on a certain revival of Killigrew's comedy the play was "presented all by women as formerly all by men." [2] But this was in later Restoration times and does not concern us here.

Minor realistic comedies of the last years of the old drama.

The years immediately preceding the closing of the theaters witnessed the performance of several comedies of greater or less merit, the work of obscure authors, all of them marking the abiding popularity of homely scenes of the life which daily surrounded the Londoner. An odd and cleanly little play of anonymous authorship is *The London Chanticleers*, 1637, in which the characters are all of them street venders such as Heath, the broom-man, Ditty, the

[1] *Davenant*, ed. Maidment and Logan, 1872, iv, 167, 195.
[2] *Historia Histrionica*, Dodsley, xv, 412.

ballad-man, and Hannah Jennetting, an apple-wench. *The Gossips' Brawl*, also anonymous and of uncertain date, is an exceedingly coarse sketch of a quarrel in an ale-house in which Doll Crabb, a fish-woman, and Meg Lantale, a "tub-woman," unite to abuse the hostess and cheat Nick Pot, the tapster, of the reckoning; [1] while Thomas Jordan's *Walks of Islington and Hogsdon* is an equally vulgar if more ambitious attempt to picture the low tavern life of the time, and is reported to have been acted in 1641 for "nineteen days together." More strictly a drama of intrigue is *A Knave in Grain* by J. D., 1639, in which inventive use is made of much old farcical material, and the disguise of a plot laid in Venice does not prevent a realistic satire on the contemporary sect known as the Brownists. *The Spightful Sister* by Abraham Baily is a cruder production in which the popular superstition of the day is employed by a debtor who, by conjuring the devil, contrives to frighten his creditor into a surrender of his bond to save his life. *The Ghost or Woman Wears the Breeches*, of unknown authorship, but described as "written in the year 1640," is an extraordinarily coarse story of a virago who, forced to marry an old usurer, literally unbreeches him and parades this emblem of her conquest of man on a pole about the stage. Lastly, two comedies of higher grade, both of them exceedingly well planned and written, are *The Swaggering Damsel*, 1640, by Robert Chamberlain, and *The Country Girl* by T. B., hastily identified as Tony Brewer.[2] In the former we have a capital picture of the relations of the family of a needy knight to that of a rich moneyed man. The

[1] *The Gossip's Brawl* was published in 1654.

[2] Printed in 1647.

scene between the two fathers as to the arrangement of a marriage portion is excellent. Some of the characters of this play stand out in the memory with a pleasing distinctness. Sir Timothy Testy is a delightful specimen of the type of father which his name imports, and Crambagge is a respectable variation on the inevitable usurer; while Sabina, who, wronged by her lover, lures him back in a disguise, is a spirited and natural young woman. *The Country Girl*, turning although it does on a widow hunt, contains much ingenious variation on that time-honored theme, and on a situation not unlike that of Shirley's *Gamester* which forms the underplot.

Summary of the later comedy of manners.

We need not here recur to the later college dramas which borrowed material (as did Randolph and Cowley) from the comedy of manners while preserving none the less a certain flavor of the universities. They disclose their ultimate paternity in the application of Aristotelian theories or a reproduction of Plautine situations or personages.[1] In summary it is to be observed that while the later comedy of manners revealed again and again the humors of Jonson, the Hogarthian realism of Middleton, or the socially somewhat more refined comedy of Fletcher, it was ever in its best examples an actual picture of its immediate time. The older comedy often reflected the civic pride of London or depicted with instructive realism the contrasted careers of vice and virtue. It recognized class distinctions, but looked upward to rank which it respected, condoning in the higher classes certain levities of conduct, but appreciating the more for this very reason the recognized *bourgeois*

[1] Cf. *The Muses' Looking Glass* of Randolph and Cowley's *Guardian* as examples.

virtues. The later comedy of manners, on the other hand, became more a matter of diversion, more commonly a picture of life viewed not sympathetically but satirically and cynically, and the attitude of the well-born playwright grew into one of contempt towards citizen or countryman whom he admitted with condescension or held up to the feathered shafts of his ridicule. It was not the least of the gathering misfortunes of the years in which England was drifting into civil war that the questions involved between Puritan and Cavalier should have resulted in arraying class against class. The theater, still — though in a limited sense — the mirror of its age, reflected this cleavage, which was parting farther and farther the tastes, pursuits, and ideals of the two, alike in the coarseness and cynicism of its comedies and in the heroic inanities of inferior tragicomedy. The average man with the wholesomeness of his average sentiment and his sane ideals of decent living was for the most part gone from the theaters which, under Puritan teachings, he had learned to reprobate as the encouragers of vice and to shun as he would shun the gins and snares of the devil. This left the frivolous and idle, the low and the brutal, in a larger proportion than earlier, representative of the actual constituency of the stage. The appeal of the drama hence became more and more an appeal to a class, and from the favorite amusement of the whole people, it shrank into the particular pastime of the few whose rank, wealth, or ambition justified their claim to enrollment in the book of polite society. The later comedies of manners are for the most part well written. They reflect with admirable fidelity the manners and conversation of the court and the gentry of their time,

and they reflect as well the loosening hold, among the classes of Englishmen who were proud to be distinguished as "Cavaliers," of that earnestness towards life and that fear of God that strengthened the councils of Hampden and armed the Ironsides of Cromwell.

# XIX

## DECADENT ROMANCE

Decadent romanticism the distinctive "note" of the drama of King Charles I.

OUR story of the English chronicle play has been fully told. Its kindred, the historical drama, whether that founded on annals of foreign countries of modern Europe or based on the richer stores of antiquity, have been traced from their beginnings to the latest specimens which held the stage before the opening of the civil war. In the last chapter, too, we brought to a conclusion our account of the successive steps by which the comedy of Jonson and Middleton was succeeded by that of Fletcher, Brome, and Shirley. It remains to us to complete the tale of romantic drama which we left as to tragedy and comedy, as well as with respect to the hybrid, tragicomedy, at the beginning of the reign of King Charles. The separation of material which this treatment involves is especially justifiable in this case; for, while the historical drama, tragedy on classical subjects, and even the masque, are earlier types persistent in the new reign, romantic drama, like the comedy of manners, took on a new character and enjoyed, in its latest modifications and decadence, a popularity hitherto unexampled. In a word, just as the chronicle play was distinctive of the last decade of the sixteenth century, or the comedy of humors and the tragedy of revenge mark the earlier years of King James, so Fletcherian tragicomedy, modified by the changed and at times fantastic ideals of the day into a de-

cadent romanticism, stands as the typical dramatic utterance of the reign of King Charles. The origin and inherent nature of this drama, with the modifications which led on insensibly to the heroic play of the Restoration, will form later themes of this chapter. We have first to trace the course of romantic comedy and tragedy through the reign of Charles and find wherein each preserved, wherein each departed, from previous work in its kind.

Theatrical repertory of the reign.

When Charles came to his throne in March, 1625, Fletcher, with half a year to live, was at the height of his popularity, and his friend, Massinger, alike in the revision of Fletcher's plays and in work more wholly his own, continued in full stream the Fletcherian traditions. In estimating the stage of King Charles, it is not to be forgotten that side by side with the rising crop of new plays came revival after revival of old favorites. The dramas of Beaumont, Fletcher, Jonson, and Shakespeare, with the makings over of many less famous plays, held the stage throughout the reign, and a liberal minority of them were revised in early Restoration times, as were some of Massinger's, Ford's, and Shirley's, to rival the emphasized tragicomedy of Davenant and Dryden and the tinsel splendors of lesser heroic plays.

Dramatists of the preceding reign that were still active.

Nearly a score of plays were licensed in the name of Massinger between the date of Fletcher's death and that of his own in March, 1640. Among them were the two tragedies, *The Roman Actor* and *Believe as You List*, both considered, by reason of their classical and historical associations, above; and some half dozen tragicomedies, for *The Great Duke* and *The Guardian*, though denominated comedies, are of a type hardly distinguishable from plays like *The*

*Picture*, *A Very Woman*, or *The Bashful Lover*.[1] To none of these dramas of Massinger need we again recur. They have already been justly regarded as the direct continuance of older romantic types, despite certain idiosyncrasies of their author. Dekker and Heywood both lived well through the reign of King Charles.[2] But the former had turned to city pageantry, the writing of pamphlets, and that final recourse of impoverished authorship, the publication of old plays, sometimes not wholly his own. As to Heywood, his domestic comedies, *The Captives* and *The English Traveller*, must have been acted, the one not long before the accession of Charles, the other soon after. *Royal King and Loyal Subject*, 1618, and *A Challenge for Beauty*, 1634, alone among the plays of Heywood, show the effect of Fletcher's tragicomedy. The former may well have been rewritten, as has been surmised, in revision of an old play, *Marshal Osric*, because of Fletcher's handling of the same theme in *The Loyal Subject* in that year. *A Challenge for Beauty* is a similar play of contest and may likewise have been written with an eye to this same production of Fletcher or such a tragicomedy as that author's and Massinger's *Laws of Candy*.[3] *A Challenge* relates how Queen Isabella of Spain haughtily boasts herself beyond comparison and above all women, and how she puts upon Bonavida, one of her courtiers who has dared to question her vaunts, the task of finding her equal or perishing for his temerity. Bonavida finds his paragon of course in English Helena, whose cleverness and devotion triumph after extraordinary

[1] Above, i, pp. 430–435; ii, pp. 42, 230, 233.
[2] Dekker died about 1641; Heywood survived until 1648
[3] For these plays, see i, pp. 337, 352; ii, pp. 223, 227.

difficulties and save her lover from death in the nick of time. A less attractive underplot, involving likewise a contest, this time in courtesies and favors between Valladaura, a Spanish gentleman, and Ferrers, an Englishman, both captains at sea, results in a similar English victory. The drama, with all its merits, is a *bourgeois* attempt to compass the fashionable cavalier's ideal of a contest for honors, and it is interesting to notice in the old popular playwright how the old English spirit that throttled the Armada bursts forth in an alien age and in a disguise that ill fits its old-fashioned hearty manner. Of the other survivors of old time, neither Middleton nor Rowley certainly produced any new play in the two years that were left the one or the dozen or more the other. As to Jonson, he was retrograde, as we have seen, into his old "humors," which had now hardened into sheer allegory.[1]

Stage history, 1625–42.

King Charles, on assuming his throne, continued the royal patronage extended to the companies by his father. King James' company became King Charles', and the chief actors of his own late company, the Prince's men, were incorporated with the King's. Queen Henrietta assumed the patronage of Lady Elizabeth's players, lately called the Queen of Bohemia's, and the young Prince Charles, born in 1630, became two years later the patron of the players who had been known in the former reign as the Palsgrave's. On the opening, in 1629, of the new theater in Salisbury Court, Charles had also extended the royal patronage to this troupe under the name of the King's Revels. But no company reorganized as the Queen's Revels, and "the Five Companies" remained

[1] Above, pp. 264–267.

now but "four;" although a fifth company, devoid of patron and without a name, continued to play variously at the Bull or the Fortune, and was known by the name of its playhouse.[1] The playhouses of the reign of King Charles were The Globe and Blackfriars, still in the hands of the King's men and the leaders of their profession; the Cockpit, occupied by Queen Henrietta's players; the Bull, the Fortune, and the new theater in Salisbury Court, these last variously occupied.[2] In 1637 Christopher Beeston attempted the revival of a company of boy actors under the joint patronage of the king and the queen; but the attempt proved a failure. Although the king was actively interested in the stage and condescended at times to take a dignified part in the masques at court, or to suggest, as we have seen, a subject for dramatic authorship, the growing Puritan spirit caused the playhouses to flourish less luxuriantly towards the close of our period, and the Puritan hand is discoverable in several enactments which will receive our attention in their proper place.[3]

Slender basis of the drama of Charles in fact.

In our survey of English tragedy in the reigns of Elizabeth and King James we found its varieties manifold, its range extending from crude if faithful pictures of the brutality of contemporary low life or of domestic crime to the consummate portraiture of famous personages of ancient and modern history and the tragical falls of great princes. Large though the various classes of tragedy were which thus dealt primarily with what was accepted as fact, a larger class were those the avowed sources of which were earlier fiction or the invention and amplification of the poet's imagination, and hence romantic in tone

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 321. [2] *Ibid.* 332. [3] Below, p. 369.

alike from their choice of novel material and from their evident attempt to present that material in a novel form. A romantic tone had come, too, to pervade many forms of drama which had hitherto preserved historical or realistic ideals. For example, the interest excited by Shakespeare's plays on the English kings is clearly historical, precisely as *Julius Cæsar* or *Coriolanus* relate in dramatic verse what is supposed actually to have happened in ancient Rome. With Ford's *Perkin Warbeck* or Massinger's *Believe as You List* the purpose of the drama has changed, and with it its method. It is the romantic situation of a claimant for a throne of whose actual identity we are not permitted to be certain that fills the center of each canvas. So, too, where Webster or Middleton dramatized the story of an historical Duchess of Malfi or an actual Bianca Capello, Shirley in contrast adapts an old story to new and ingenious situations (in his *Cardinal*), and Ford invents (in *'Tis Pity* as in *The Broken Heart*) out of the whole cloth.[1] In a word, fidelity to the actual event and the old faithfulness to the example where the theme was historical have been superseded by an inventive drama intent to put the hypothetical case or at least to appeal to the sense of novelty rather than to tie to known events.

Shirley's romantic dramas; their range and variety.

We have already traced the general career of James Shirley and recorded in the last chapter his generous contribution to the later comedy of manners; in an earlier one his place in the history of the English masque.[2] But Shirley's masques and comedies of manners represent scarcely more than a third of the

[1] Above, i, pp. 586, 589; below, ii, pp. 330–333.
[2] Above, pp, 131, 132, 284–297.

dramatic productions that came from his fertile pen. For the nonce let us turn to Shirley's romantic dramas, which, rising in point of number to just a score, range in character from light comedies such as *The Humorous Courtier* and pure extravaganza like *The Bird in the Cage* to serious dramas like *The Grateful Servant*, pseudo-histories such as *The Politician*, and tragedies like *The Traitor* or *The Cardinal*. In point of time Shirley's romantic plays scatter throughout his career; they are ushered in with *The Maid's Revenge*, licensed by Herbert in February, 1626, Shirley's second play; and they extend beyond the period of his latest comedy of manners to *The Sisters*, licensed in April, 1642, and *The Court Secret*, which was written too late to escape the act which closed the London theaters to public performances. By the time that Shirley came to write, the elemental distinction between tragedy and comedy had come to be commonly obscured by the practice of tragicomedy, which frequently averted the necessary catastrophe in the interests of "the happy ending," or at least distributed rewards and punishments with the even hand of distributive justice. *The Politician*, for example, concludes with the discomfiture and death of all the conspirators and wicked figures in the cast; the virtuous, save one, are preserved for future happiness. Such a play is only half a tragedy, and the moral struggle has been supplanted by intrigue and counter-intrigue. Nor is the line of demarcation between serious drama and pure comedy much more surely drawn, as such a play as *The Opportunity* must disclose. For which reasons, although none could doubt the absolute tragedy of *The Maid's Revenge*, or *The Cardinal*, or the sheer comedy of *The Humorous*

Breaking down of the distinction between tragedy and comedy.

*Courtier*, the majority of Shirley's romantic dramas are of one class, and a separation of the comic from the tragic becomes purely artificial. With this caveat, we may group Shirley's romantic plays into lighter comedies; tragicomedies in which is maintained, to a greater or less degree, an historical atmosphere; tragicomedies of romantic intrigue, free from the semblance of history; and lastly the four plays which fulfill the stricter conditions of tragedy.

Shirley's lighter romantic comedies:

Three romantic comedies of Shirley belong to the year 1632 and the years which immediately follow. These are *The Arcadia*, *The Bird in a Cage*, and *The Opportunity*. If the identification of *The Humorous Courtier* with a comedy licensed as *The Duke* in 1631 and revived as *The Conceited Duke* eight years later is to be accepted, all four of Shirley's lighter romantic comedies fall within the earliest years of his activity.[1] The vivacity and extraordinary grossness of this comedy, as well as the unusual corruptness of its text, all point to the probability of an early date. *The Arcadia* is described as "a pastoral," and was originally acted at court to celebrate the king's birthday, November 19, 1632.[2] As a matter of fact, in this dramatization of the principal events of Sidney's famous romance the slight pastoral element of the original has entirely evaporated. It seems more likely that Shirley went direct to Sidney than to Day's *Isle of Gulls*, in which are employed mainly the same events.[3] Shirley has given a more serious cast to the main story by including the supposed death of Basilaus and the trial. *The Arcadia* is con-

*The Arcadia*, 1632.

[1] See Fleay, ii, 237.
[2] *Ibid.* ii, 239, and cf. *The Arcadia*, III, ii.
[3] Cf. above, i, p. 397.

spicuous among Shirley's dramas for its close following of his chosen material; it is memorable for no other reason. In *The Bird in a Cage* Shirley turned to pure extravaganza.[1] A suitor, banished the court of Mantua, returns in disguise and wagers with the Duke that, provided with sufficient money, he will make his way into the presence of the Duke's daughter, who has been immured by her father with all her ladies in a castle under strong guard. In the event of failure the lover is to lose his life for his effrontery. His achievement is a foregone conclusion. A savagely ironical dedication to Prynne, then in prison for his offensive allusion to the queen's acting, supports Malone's surmise that the title of Shirley's play was changed and the play itself adapted to the circumstance of the moment.[2] *The Bird in a Cage* is full of contemporary satirical allusion and deserves more attention than it has received.

*The Bird in a Cage*, 1633.

Lastly, among these lighter productions we reach *The Opportunity*, licensed in 1634, "acted at the private house in Drury Lane," and apparently a close rendering of *El Castigo del Penséque* by Tirso de Molina.[3] A gentleman of Milan named Aurelio, visitor to Urbino, is mistaken, through a fancied

*The Opportunity*, 1634.

[1] Fleay, ii, 239, identifies this play with *The Beauties*, licensed in January, 1633; Malone, *Shakespeare*, iii, 232.

[2] For an account of Prynne's book, *Histriomastix*, see above, pp. 88, 89, 173, 174.

[3] On this topic, see Stiefel, "Die Nachahmung spanischer Komödien in England unter den ersten Stuarts," *Romanische Forschungen*, v, 197–220. Tirso's play is itself modeled on Lope's *La Occasion Perdida*. See A. Dessoff, "Über englische, italienische und spanische Dramen," *Studien für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, i, 421. Stiefel claims a Spanish origin also for *The Wedding*, *The Young Admiral*, *The Humorous Courtier*, *The Example*, and *The Royal Master*.

resemblance, for one Borgia recently recalled from banishment, and in a spirit of adventure accepts the situation. Introduced at court as Borgia, the Duchess takes a fancy to him and makes him her secretary, but he feels drawn to Cornelia, sister of the man whom he is impersonating. In an intrigue considerably complicated by the presence of the Duke of Ferrara, suitor to the Duchess, and by the suit of Ursini, the previous court favorite, for the hand of Cornelia, Aurelio stands distraught between his affection for Cornelia and the opportunity which the Duchess' favor holds out to him. He yields to ambition, avows his love to the Duchess and is scorned for his pains; but bidden immediately after to write at her dictation a letter avowing her love, appointing a meeting, and promising her hand, she signs the letter, and when asked to whom to direct it, replies: "To him that loves me best." [1] In this dilemma Aurelio palters, gives over the letter to the Duke, repents it, tries to meet the Duchess before him, fails, and in the end, turning to Cornelia with the avowal of his love and his identity, is refused by her also. *The Opportunity* is a model comedy of intrigue, and the development of Aurelio's character by his novel situation is well conceived and admirably executed.

Shirley's "historical" tragicomedies: *The Young Admiral*, 1633.

Among the tragicomedies of Shirley which maintain to a greater or less degree an historical background, *Chabot* has already claimed attention.[2] *The Young Admiral*, 1633, is a bustling drama full of action and wholesome in tone. Herbert went out of his way in licensing Shirley's work to declare his "delight and satisfaction in the reading" of it, and

[1] *The Opportunity*, IV, i.

[2] Above, I, p. 420.

to hold it up as "a pattern to other poets, not only for the bettering of manners and language, but for the improvement of the quality which," he justly concludes, "hath received some brushings of late."[1] *The Coronation*, which was written, like *Chabot*, in 1635, is a play of finer fiber, well planned, and carrying out to the full the tragicomic ideal of a series of quick and unexpected changes, involving threatened danger and death strangely averted. Two princes, for their protection, have been reared, neither knowing that he is a prince nor that he has a brother. Their sister has been regarded as sole heir to the throne, and on her coronation day defeats the plans of the Lord Protector—ominous and prophetic title in 1635—to marry her to his son, by choosing the younger of her brothers as the partner to her throne. This choice compels an avowal of the identity of the prince; and the discontent of the Protector at the failure of his plans causes him to set up the other brother as a claimant to the throne, little thinking that he is supporting the true prince. The *dénouement* is obvious. There is a refined, a chivalric atmosphere about this play which, however at variance with ancient "Epire," in which the scene is laid, is refreshing of any time and place. The characters, too, are well differentiated; and Sophia, the princess, is a noble and capable young woman.

*The Coronation*, 1635.

Neither *The Doubtful Heir*, 1640, a pseudo-his-

[1] Herbert's *List*, Malone, *Shakespeare*, iii, 232. An imitation of a scene of *The Alchemist* in this play is interesting as an almost unique example of such borrowing by Shirley. Cf. *The Young Admiral*, iv, i; *The Alchemist*, iii, v. According to Stiefel, *Romanische Forschungen*, v, 196, Shirley's play is an adaptation of Lope de Vega's *Don Lope de Cardona*. Stiefel offers no parallels.

Other pseudo-historical romances.

torical romance full of vicissitude and change, nor *The Court Secret*, which was not acted until after the Restoration, need detain us. The scenes of both are laid in Spain, the only examples apparently of the employment by Shirley of plots concerning the Peninsula. *St. Patrick for Ireland*, printed in 1640, was of course written for the Dublin stage. This is one of the most curious dramas of later times, combining, as it does, the elements of a miracle play, a chronicle history, and a tragicomedy of romantic intrigue. The circumstance that it was printed as "the first part" and that both prologue and epilogue held out the promise of a second, leads to the supposition that Shirley was sanguine of success in this extraordinary experiment. The surmise of Ward that Shirley may have conceived the idea of such a play from Kirke's *Seven Champions of Christendom*, a production of the old extravagant heroical type, printed in 1638, seems not unlikely.

*The Politician*, 1639.

In *The Politician* Shirley essayed a play of more serious and ambitious type than the tragicomedies just described. This production was not licensed, unless it be capable of identification with *The Politic Father*, allowed in May, 1641.[2] It has been placed in the year 1639. It was written for the Salisbury Court theater. Langbaine refers us for a parallel subject to *The Countess of Montgomery's Urania*, a romance of the type of the *Arcadia*, written by Lady Mary Wroth, niece of Sir Philip Sidney and pub-

[1] Ward, iii, 100 note.

[2] Fleay, ii, 242, 246, objects to this because *The Politic Father* was licensed for the King's company, while *The Politician* was acted by the Queen's men. Fleay believes *The Politician* to have been first acted in Dublin.

lished in 1621.[1] But it seems improbable that Shirley received more than a hint from this source. The scene of *The Politician* is Norway; the protagonist is Gotharus, councilor of state to a weak and credulous king. The king has married, for the second time, Marpissa, between whom and Gotharus a *liaison* of mingled love and ambition has long subsisted. It was for Marpissa's son, young Haraldus, whom the politician believed also to be his own, that both were plotting. But Haraldus, though an amiable lad, was of weak constitution; while Turgesius, the son of the king by his first marriage, against whom all the politician's plots were leveled, was a warlike prince, beloved of the soldiery and under the especial protection of his bluff and kindly uncle, the Duke Olaus. Out of this material Shirley constructed a very effective drama in which Queen Marpissa, "proud, subtle, and revengeful," is contrasted with the neglected, virtuous, and suffering wife of Gotharus; the supine and foolishly doting king with the outspoken military Olaus; and the sickly and pathetic figure of little Haraldus with Turgesius returned successful from the wars with a devoted army at his heels. No other play of Shirley's is constructed so frankly on the method of contrast. In the event, both soldiery and rabble rise, believing their beloved prince to have been killed by the treachery of Gotharus. And Haroldus dying, Marpissa turns against her lover and gives him, under guise of a cordial, a vial of poison which he takes in extremity when, pursued by the mob, he has taken refuge in a coffin supposedly pre-

[1] Langbaine, p. 481. It is interesting to recall that it was to this noble and literary lady that Jonson dedicated *The Alchemist* in 1610.

pared for the Prince. Strained to the verge of improbability though much of it is, there is a holding power in the last scene of this tragedy into which is crowded the unexpected discovery of the dead traitor, the pitiable lamentations of his miserable wife, the splendid Marpissa at bay, and the reconciliation of the Prince and his father. As already remarked, *The Politician* is, after all, but half a tragedy. It is only the evil-doers who fall; the good survive to future happiness. In such plays as this and under the strong influence of contemporary tragicomedy, the idea of tragedy as an expiation breaks down and the death of the protagonist becomes no more than the fitting conclusion of a wicked life.

Shirley's tragicomedies of court intrigue.

We turn now to the class of Shirley's romantic tragicomedies which assume not even the semblance of history. All are laid as to scene in principalities of Italy, and center, to a greater or less degree, in the amorous intrigues of the court life of these petty states. They belong to no one period of Shirley's activity, but extend, with his other plays, throughout the reign. The earliest of these is *The Grateful Servant*, licensed in 1629, an ingenious play not without much genuine merit, and turning upon the adventures of a princess disguised as a page in the court of her lover, the Duke of Savoy, with other clever manipulations of old material. This tragicomedy is memorable, if for no other reason, for the noble figure of the disinterested Foscari, who maintains the report of his own death lest his presence defeat the project of the Duke to raise Cleona, Foscari's beloved, to a place by his side. In 1636 followed *The Duke's Mistress*, sometimes chronicled as a tragedy from a misprint so describing it in the prefatory note

of Dyce's edition of Shirley's works.[1] Here again we meet with a novel treatment of old and familiar figures: the infatuated prince, the faithless intriguer caught in the end in his own toils, the imperious beauty, known as the duke's mistress, preserving her virtue in this case, however, despite appearances, the neglected wife, and the bluff and honest captain. The stage of the day seems never to have wearied of these anticipated puppets, and doubtless their familiarity as well as the unexpected relations into which they were thrown by such masters of change as Shirley, served to maintain their popularity.

*The Royal Master* is the most interesting of this group of Shirley's tragicomedies, for while we are ushered here once more into the familiar group of a court thrown into confusion by a seeming favorite, the character of the fair maiden Domitilla and her honest infatuation for her king, with its cure, offers a pleasing variation on an outworn theme.[2] Shirley's conception of virtuous womanhood is much above that of Fletcher, and measurably superior to Massinger's. Shirley knew the court of his day wherein, whatever the freer manners of the time, King Charles and Henrietta Maria upheld a gracious ideal of domestic virtue. True, Shirley's heroines, like those of his predecessors, resolve themselves mainly into two types: the imperious beauty, — Ardelia, Sophia, the Duchess Rosaura, and the Duchess of *The Opportunity*, — on the one hand;[3] the lovable, enduring, and

*The Royal Master*, licensed 1638.

Shirely's heroines.

[1] Ward, iii, 97 ; and Dyce-Gifford, *Shirley*, iv, 190.

[2] This play, too, has been referred to a Spanish source. Cf. Stiefel, as above, p. 196.

[3] *The Duke's Mistress*, *The Coronation*, *The Cardinal*.

devoted maiden, — Cleona, Polidora, Cassandra,[1] — in whom faith to a lover becomes a religion, on the other. But it cannot be said that these latter are often insipid; and in his romantic plays, save for such tragic figures as those of Marpissa in *The Politician* and Clariana in *Love's Cruelty*, it cannot be avowed that Shirley delights to picture wanton womanhood. *The Imposture*, licensed on Shirley's last return from Ireland, in 1640, and highly esteemed by the author, is full of action but based on a plot involving deception by means of impersonation carried to the degree of utter improbability. Finally, *The Sisters*, 1642, enjoys the melancholy distinction of being one of the latest plays to be licensed for the pre-Restoration stage. This production, which turns on the old contrast of a haughty and a submissive sister, is hasty and unworthy the repute of its author.

*The Sisters*, 1642.

The tragedies of Shirley: *The Maid's Revenge*, 1626.

Let us turn now to the tragedies, which are to be found equally scattered through the long period of Shirley's activity. *The Maid's Revenge*, 1626, Shirley's earliest effort in this kind, is a tragedy of much promise, swift in action, capably plotted, and fluently and lucidly written, on a theme derived from Reynolds' *God's Revenge against Murder*.[2] The single plot relates the sudden passion which young Antonio de Ribiero inspires in two sisters, his exchange of vows with Berinthia, the younger, and the elder's intrigues against the lovers, by which she brings about their deaths, her brother's, and her own. The characters are differentiated chiefly in their adventures, and the element of relief is afforded by an inventive variation of several familiar personages, — the braggart, the

[1] *The Grateful Servant*, *The Coronation*, *The Young Admiral*.

[2] Book II, history 7.

charlatan doctor, and the witty page. *The Maid's Revenge* is melodramatic, and the *dénouement*, involving as it does a sudden change in Berinthia's nature, is inartistic. But the play is otherwise natural, healthy in tone, and — matter for surprise — absolutely free from the influence of Fletcher. Indeed, to this dominating influence Shirley never submitted, but seems from the first to have sought a new and legitimate channel in which to continue the traditions of the older romantic drama. No less independent, too, was Shirley of Massinger and his rhetorician's substitution of a moral for an æsthetic purpose, and of Ford's dangerous suggestion of a problem for intellectual analysis on the basis of disturbed emotional equilibrium.

Shirley's independence in his art.

Two tragedies of Shirley were licensed in 1631, *The Traitor* in May, *Love's Cruelty* in November. The former is a play of quasi-historical cast and is well-knit, direct, and effective. It is surprising to find how successfully this consummate dramatist has contrived to throw the worn-out puppets — a lustful prince, scheming favorite, steadfast maiden, and foolish new-made lord — into attitudes both novel and interesting. Nor does all depend by any means on situation. The amazing effrontery of Lorenzo, the traitor, his resourcefulness in danger of discovery and subtle play with Sciarrha, his dangerous and passionate dupe, even the comically lugubrious figure of Depazzi, the *parvenu*, whose weak head cannot stand the strong wine of treason, such figures are of the essence of true drama. A theme consonant with the passing fashion of the moment is that of Cosimo's sacrifice of love to his ideal of friendship, whilst the ingenious *dénouement* could not but have

*The Traitor*, 1631.

claimed the admiration of even the most hardened *habitué* of the stage of its time alike for its novelty and for its completeness. It is impossible to find a more successful drama of its type than Shirley's *Traitor*. *Love's Cruelty* is a less conspicuous work and turns upon a domestic tragedy, although the subject is suggested in part by a tale of Cinthio, and the romantic Italian atmosphere has been retained.[1] The episode out of which the tragedy grows is a striking one, although the underplot employs once more Shirley's favorite situation, a *roué* won to a better life by the steadfast resistance of a virtuous woman to his advances.[2]

*Love's Cruelty*, 1631.

Shirley's latest tragedy, *The Cardinal*, licensed in November, 1641, is likewise his best. Here we return to familiar Navarre and to the close atmosphere of court intrigue; but the familiar personages and situations are lit up once more with a new light, and what seems to begin in reminiscence ends in effective novelty. The relation of the Duchess Rosaura to the Count d'Alvarez is not unlike that of the Duchess of Malfi to her husband, Antonio Bologna. The politic Cardinal, the King's aspiring favorite, the honest soldier, hastily dishonored by a great man, these things are the mere dead timber of romantic drama. But Shirley has refashioned them all. The Duchess Rosaura, young, beautiful, and wealthy, is destined by the Cardinal's contrivance and the King's command to marry the proud and fiery Columbo, the Cardinal's nephew; but the lady loves Alvarez. She contrives to get from Columbo a release of his claim to her hand, takes it to the King and obtains his con-

*The Cardinal*, 1641.

[1] *Hecatomithi*, III, vi; Langbaine, 480.

[2] Cf. above, p. 296.

sent to her marriage with Alvarez. Here Shirley gives us one of the most artfully prepared climaxes in the range of our drama. Her ladyship has had words with the Cardinal and matched him in cleverness and repartee;[1] but the King commands reconciliation, and the Cardinal has consented even to attend her wedding. A capital scene of comedy now follows in which the servants of the Duchess are represented preparing for a masque.[2] They are interrupted in the moment of their entrance by a company of revelers, "in gallant equipage newly alighted," who call the bridegroom, Alvarez, aside for the moment and, returning, lay his dead body at the feet of his bride, Columbo standing forth to justify his bloody deed. The resolution of this extraordinary climax is skillful and leisurely. Columbo under the Cardinal's influence is restored to favor, but is killed in duel by Hernando, a colonel whom he had disgraced and who had vowed himself Alvarez's avenger. The Duchess seemingly loses her mind and is intrusted to the Cardinal as his ward, after the custom of the time. The catastrophe is fretted by a confusion of drinking potions, a device so dear to our old tragedians; but the Duchess' vengeance is carried to the Cardinal by the valiant hand of her agent, Hernando, in the end, and the Duchess herself falls in the moment of the triumph of her revenge, so that the tragedy is complete. This supreme effort of Shirley has been criticised as to the figure of the Cardinal, who, it is objected, "cannot be said to become its principal

[1] *The Cardinal*, II, iii.

[2] *Ibid.* III, ii.

[3] Cf. *Hamlet*, *Woman Beware Woman*, the catastrophe of each.

personage till towards the end of the play."[1] But when we consider that the entire motive power of the tragedy lies in the Cardinal's ambition to put his nephew in possession of the fortune of the Duchess, until that ambition is transformed into revenge for his thwarted plans, the figure of the silent and implacable churchman, who "holds intelligence with every bird i' the air" and "sits at the helm of state," seems even more impressive in the earlier part of the play than later where he struts the stage in all "his purple pride."[2]

Shirley in tragedy.

*The Cardinal* was the latest English tragedy to achieve success along the beaten track of romantic drama. Whatever is true of other works, the tragedies of Shirley remained to the last singularly independent of the traditions which Fletcher had established for serious drama. Ever adequate of phrase and absolute master of a limpid and perspicuous style which rarely leaves the reader to puzzle over a single line, Shirley escapes the rhetorical extremes of Massinger, though he as rarely rises to the heightened imagery and suffused thought that maintains for Fletcher his place among the poets. Sufficiency, moderation, inventiveness,—such are the virtues of Shirley. A restoration of simplicity in plot, the supression of the underplot to an episode or two fashioned for comic relief, a greater naturalness of detail combined with an often ingenious manipulation of familiar personages and situations into "something new and strange," such are Shirley's services to romantic drama; although in all of this it must be confessed that he little affected the counter trend of his age.

[1] Ward, iii, 98.

[2] *The Cardinal*, I, i; Dyce-Gifford, *Shirley*, v, 278.

If versatility and inventiveness in ringing changes on old material thus distinguished Shirley, a stranger and subtler originality, and one far more difficult of analysis-marks the distinctive work of John Ford. For his two comedies, so contrastedly characteristic, for the poetry which he contributed to his and Dekker's beautiful "moral masque," *The Sun's Darling*, and for the overpowering pathos of the scenes attributed to him in the domestic tragedy, *The Witch of Edmonton*, the reader must be referred back to the passages in this book which treat them.[1] Ford's daring and successful attempt, likewise, to revive in *Perkin Warbeck* the forgotten glories of the chronicle play has claimed our discussion elsewhere.[2] We are here concerned with the Ford of romantic tragedy, with the Ford whose wonderful and dangerous powers of analysis and emotional casuistry stretched art and ethics beyond their legitimate spheres and foreboded a new departure in literature. Ford was a Devonshire man, born in 1586, and related to Chief Justice Popham. The last years of the old queen's reign found him a student of Exeter College, Oxford, and later of the Middle Temple. Between 1606 and 1620 Ford put forth several pamphlets of no great literary import, and enjoyed, after the manner of the time, the fitful patronage of several noble patrons, among them the literary Earl, later Duke, of Newcastle. It has been thought that Ford followed the law as a legal agent or factor. Ford's extant plays lie between 1621, the date earliest assignable to *The Witch of Edmonton*, which he wrote in conjunction with Dekker and William Rowley, and *The Lady's Trial*, acted late in

John Ford, 1586–1640 or later.

[1] Above, i, pp. 362, 363; ii, pp. 137, 297–299.

[2] See i, p. 306.

1637.[1] His association with authors includes not only the names just mentioned, but also those of Webster, Shirley, Brome, and Crashaw. His collaboration with Dekker, Rowley, and Webster was perhaps chiefly by way of revision of their earlier work, and it may be questioned if his association with the stage was as wholly unprofessional as his repeated assertions might appear to sustain.[2] Indeed, Ford seems to have been as much troubled about his amateur standing as a modern American college athlete. He protests too much, urging again and again that his plays are "the fruits of his leisure," "the issue of his less serious hours," and that his "courtship of greatness" never "aimed at any thrift." [3] This attitude is further emphasized by Ford's pose for originality and a Jonsonian assumption of a censorship over his age. Ford cares not, he tells us, "to please the many;" and affirms that his plays

> "He doth not owe
> To others' fancies, nor hath he lain in wait
> For any stolen invention, from whose height
> He might commend his own," [4] —

boasts which the originality of most of his plots goes far to justify.

[1] Four plays assigned to Ford were destroyed with the Warburton manuscripts. These were *Beauty in a Trance*, *The Royal Combat*, *The London Merchant*, and *An Ill Beginning has a Good End*. The first was registered for publication in 1653, the other three in 1660. See Fleay, i, 234, on this topic. *The Fairy Knight* was registered as by Ford and Dekker in 1624.

[2] Cf. especially, the Prologue to *The Lover's Melancholy*:

> "It is art's scorn that some of late have made
> The noble use of poetry a trade."

[3] See the dedications to the play just quoted, to *'Tis Pity*, and to *The Broken Heart*.

[4] Prologue to *The Lover's Melancholy*.

Ford's romantic tragedies.

Ford is the author of three romantic tragedies, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, *The Broken Heart*, and *Love's Sacrifice*, all of them first printed in the year 1633. The first and third were acted by Queen Henrietta's players at the Phœnix, and have been referred respectively to the years 1626 and 1630. *The Broken Heart* was first performed at the Blackfriars by the King's men, perhaps as early as 1629.[1] To these may here be added *The Lover's Melancholy*, a tragicomedy of kindred spirit, described by the author as "in this kind" with him "the first that ever courted reader." [2] The precise chronology of these plays is indeterminable. *The Lover's Melancholy* was licensed for the King's men in 1628, and must have followed *'Tis Pity* and preceded the two other tragedies. *The Lover's Melancholy* turns on a double restoration from melancholia to a normal state of mind; first in a prince the beloved object of whose brooding affection has been spirited from him, but who returns, thereby recovering him; secondly, in the case of an elderly counselor, whose dignities, estate, and daughter have been torn from him, but who is restored to mental health on the tide of returning happiness. This novel subject for a play was clearly suggested to Ford by the then new and popular book, Robert Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy* (1621), which he follows in detail in a tasteless masque of madmen.[3] On the other hand, the influence of Fletcher is apparent in the Bellario-like heroine whom the reader meets first in the vale of Tempe in musical duel with a nightingale, and who troubles the heart of mistress and maid alike in

*The Lover's Melancholy*, 1628.

[1] Fleay, i, 233.

[2] See the dedication to this play.

[3] *The Lover's Melancholy*, iii, 3, and cf. Burton, ed. Shilleto, 1893, i, 158 ff.

her assumed masculine perfections.[1] Well written and pathetic as this tragicomedy is in parts, much of it is unduly protracted, and the low comedy, as commonly with Ford, is beneath contempt.

The tragedies of Ford: *Love's Sacrifice;*

Let us turn now to Ford's three tragedies, *Love's Sacrifice*, *'Tis Pity*, and *The Broken Heart.* The first is a tale of love and jealousy in which the revenge of Philippo Caraffa, Duke of Pavia, the injured husband, is frustrated by the "heroism" of the lovers, whose strife against their infatuation and pause, barely short of the consummation of their infidelity, raises in the reader a false sympathy for their fate — a fate which is really deserved. *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* is a horrible story of incestuous love falsely suffused with a sentimental interest, and played and dallied with in a manner alike daring and seductive. Causistry, eloquence, and poetry are lavished on this monstrous creation, and reminiscences of Romeo, Juliet, her nurse, and Friar Laurence flit across the mind as we read of these fatally infatuated lovers, Giovanni and Annabella. But their figures and those that surround them are distorted, as natural objects are distorted in the brain into grotesque and revolting images by the fumes of some deadly drug. In a word, these two plays mark the most notable trait of Ford, a peculiar and dangerous power of analysis, of poetical casuistry, which stretches art and ethics beyond their legitimate spheres, and which, clothed, as all is, in consummate poetic art, has the quality

*'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, both printed 1633.

Ford's poetical cauistry.

[1] With this sentimental episode compare Crashaw's poem, *Music's Duel*, and the original of both English poets, the Latin hexameters of Famianus Strada, *Prolusiones Academicæ*, ed. 1617, p. 353. For other parallels and "suggestions" in this play, see Koeppel, ii, 174.

of a strange and unnatural originality like a gorgeous and scented but poisonous exotic of the jungle.

*The Broken Heart*, c. 1629.

In *The Broken Heart* Ford recovered a healthier equilibrium and produced an abiding monument of sentimental art. The pride of Ithocles, a young general of the Spartans against the Messenians, had caused him to interfere in the true love of Penthea, his sister, for her suitor, Orgilus, and to insist upon her marriage with Bassanes, a noble of greater wealth. Bassanes proves unreasonably and brutally jealous, and keeps Penthea immured as in a prison, whilst she, in her broken faith to Orgilus, regards her married life a life of shame, although her virtue is proof even against the passionate pleadings of her lover. Orgilus, overwhelmed with melancholy, pretends a journey to Athens, but really remains in Sparta, disguised, to await the course of events. Ithocles returns victorious, chivalrously acknowledges his wrong to Penthea and Orgilus, and joins them in furthering a marriage between his friend Prophilus and the sister of Orgilus, whilst he himself becomes a suitor for the hand of Calantha, heiress to the Spartan throne, and is accepted by her in preference to Nearchus, her cousin, prince of Argos. But Penthea sickens and dies and Orgilus becomes desperate. So, despite the noble courtesy of Ithocles, Orgilus traps him by means of a mechanical chair and murders him on the eve of his wedding to Calantha.[1] The final act of this tra-

[1] Koeppel, ii, 177, suggests that Ford borrowed this device from Barnes' tragedy, *The Devil's Charter*, a suggestion the more likely in that Barnes appears among the writers of commendatory verses in *Fame's Memorial*, eulogistic verses published by Ford in 1611 on the death of the Earl of Devonshire, the unfortunate Lord Mountjoy.

gedy has been highly praised for its structural rise to an heroic and surprising catastrophe, and as severely criticised for constraint and unnaturalness.[1] Calantha is represented in the midst of the stately "revels" which precede her approaching nuptials with Ithocles, when word is whispered her that her father, the King, is dead, yet she continues the measure which she is dancing. Then follows the news that the unhappy Penthea is "pined to death," and hard upon it comes Orgilus to boast of his murder of Ithocles. The measure concluded, Calantha, now Queen of Sparta, metes out death as the fruit of the murderer's crime; and, arrayed in royal robes on the temple steps before which stands the hearse of Ithocles, her beloved, arranges the affairs of state, making Nearchus her successor; espouses with a ring her dead love, and falls before her people, equally with Penthea the lady of the broken heart. The very fact that it is impossible to describe this scene in words which can conceal its artfulness and preserve in any wise the heroic dignity and surpassing pathos of the situation is a sufficient tribute to Ford's subtle art. Nor does it seem true, as sometimes suggested, that the play was written for this single climax.[2] *The Broken Heart* is a compact and admirably planned tragedy, its characters, save for the wretched Bassanes, breathe a dignity, nobility, and pathos truly tragic and seem immeasurably removed, in their unreal Sparta, from the heated intrigues of the petty Italian states which form the background of Ford's two other tragedies.

[1] Ward, iii, 81; Hazlitt, *Lectures on Dramatic Literature*, ed. 1902, v, 272, where the suggestion for this surprising scene is referred to Marston's *Malcontent*, iv, i, 68–100.

[2] *Ibid.* 182.

For no one of these plays has a source yet been discovered, and consonant though they are with the practices of the drama which preceded them, Ford's freedom from the influence of Italian models is as remarkable as his independence, after we leave *The Lover's Melancholy*, of the pervading influences of Fletcher and Shirley.[1] Above all, the plays of Ford are informed with a beauty of expression and that spirit of true poetry which fashions words from the glow of actual emotion. There had been no such poetry in tragedy since the days of Webster; and Shirley seems tame and unstable, Massinger strident, in comparison with the rich, low music of much of the blank verse of Ford. In the lyrics of *The Broken Heart*, too, Ford claims intimate kinship with the greatest lyrists of his age.

Ford's originality in plot.

No change in the growth and development of the drama of the times of James and Charles is more marked than that which took place in the ethical basis of the plays of the day. The earliest plays, whether at court or in the city, were often coarse, and contained allusions in the conversations of gentlemen, and even of gentlemen with gentlewomen, which shock the cleaner sensibilities of our day; but there is in them, for the most part and none the less, a wholesome pervading moral atmosphere. They are, after all, ethically clean. It is faithfulness to the actualities of life that tempts Shakespeare into what would to-day be conceived lapses of good taste. Even with some of the comedy scenes of the earlier part of *Measure for Measure*, the temptation of Marina in *Pericles*, and the unpleasant device by which Helena wins back

Deterioration in the ethical standards of later drama.

[1] On the "sources" of Ford, none the less, see Koeppel, ii, 172–197.

her husband in *All's Well* in mind, we may affirm this as a general truth. Such is not true of some of Middleton's comedies of manners or of the tragedies of Ford, just discussed, which we feel, at times, were written for the pleasure of trifling with vice and dallying with the devil. Shakespeare writes of the passionate love of Romeo and Juliet, of the earth earthy but pure and clean, and at once natural and poetical; Fletcher disfigures his most heroic character, Philaster, by making him the victim of a jealousy which only an unclean mind could conceive, and illumes the alabaster whiteness of the incomparable Princess Arthusa by creating for her an ugly blackened foil, Megra. More, in another love tale, he heightens the interest by raising between the lovers an ominous cloud by letting us believe that there is a terrible let and hindrance to their love in their consanguinity, only to dissipate it all in the end and laugh at us for the anxiety or perhaps prurient interest which we have taken in the tale.[1] Ford went beyond all this to offer us this situation in its terrible and tragical reality, to work upon our feelings of pity, to shake our ethical code, and make a problem of a subject which should hardly be mentioned. There can be no question of Ford's art, whether for its fidelity to nature, its analytic power, its poetry, or its dramatic passion. But why such topics? The answer is twofold. First, a long and successful dramatic age had preceded Ford and the range of characters and dramatic situations had been already worked to the utmost. In his search after originality, Ford strained his art in this direction and added the analysis of the human heart in a predicament of danger to soul as well as to

Ford's strained and intolerable situations.

[1] See *A King and No King*.

the body to the teeming categories of English dramatic art. The analogues of this are Massinger's substitution of moral earnestness for the old poetic justice, and Shirley's revived simplicity and ingenuity of plot; for both are equally referable to an eager search after the novel and effective. Secondly, Ford recognized the change that had come over the audience of his time. Puritanism had taken many from the theater, it had estranged the God-fearing, the serious-minded, whether from the walks of every-day London or the court, and the constituency thus left was more frivolous, more jaded in its appetite for pleasure, more in need of strong and unusual stimulants in its art than the audience of Shakespeare's hey-day, which represented very nearly all England. Hence this change, and hence, too, Ford's success.

Ford's dramatic method, that of analysis.

In the upshot Ford has added a new province to the material of the drama in the creation of a situation intolerable to an ordinary acceptation of the relations of men, and in treating this he added a new method to the literature of his day — common enough to ours — the method of analysis. Shakespeare had already foreboded this in *Hamlet*, which is, when all has been said, less a play than a supreme study of character, of soul in a position peculiar though not strained. But Shakespeare, none the less, constructed a harmonious whole about his central study and problem. Ford writes his play for his problem. *The Broken Heart* rises on an artfully constructed ascending plane to the last consummate scene. *Perkin Warbeck* must have attracted Ford because of the problematic identity of that pretender to Henry's throne; and the artfulness with which the poet has contrived to leave this problem, like that of *Love's Sacrifice* and *'Tis*

*Pity*, unsolved is not the least count in the triumph of his art.

The tragi-comedies of Richard Brome:

Whilst Massinger and Shirley were thus dividing the honors of romantic drama between them, save for the few years when the daring originality and surpassing poetry of Ford wrested the scepter from the hands of both, Carlell, Cartwright, Glapthorne, Arthur Wilson, and many others continued with varied success the traditions of Fletcherian tragi-comedy; Davenant began his long dramatic career with an attempted revival of the old tragedy of blood, but fell, too, under the spell of Fletcher; and even Brome left his favorite comedies of life seen from below stairs to essay, with his heavy but honest hand, the subtleties of dramatized intrigue and romance. Strange as it may appear, not one of these ventures of the old servant of Jonson is without its interest.

*The Lovesick Court*, acted *c.* 1627.

*The Lovesick Court* tells of the heroic deadlock of two Thessalian youths, bred as brothers, and both lovers of the Princess Eudina, who is as unable to decide between them as they are unable to determine the matter for themselves, each placing friendship above love. The influences on the making of this play are more obvious than usual. Eudina's difficulty and nature is much that of Emilia in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, the relation of the brothers and sisters of the play suggests the situation of *The Coronation* reversed, though Shirley's play was licensed later. The talkative nurse is modeled on Shakespeare, and the casuistical talk of a sister's love for a brother ought to fix the date of *'Tis Pity* as prior to Brome's play. Brome lacked the ease and subtlety to compass such a play, and his *Lovesick Court* remains a parody on its kind. The originality of the intrigue

raises *The Queen's Exchange*, acted about 1632, to a higher position. Here we have a romantic tragi-comedy in guise of a chronicle history of Saxon times, in which are echoes of the story of Gloster and his two sons in *Lear* and another of *'Tis Pity* in the midst of an intricate and elaborate plot. The character of old Segebert is not without a certain natural pathos, and the exchange of suitors by which a stranger fills the Northumbrian throne while its king seeks a wife in Wessex is cleverly worked out. Brome's last romantic play, which must date between 1635 and 1640, is entitled *Queen and Concubine*, and is by far his best effort in its species.[1] The King of Sicily, like Henry VIII in history, has become infatuated with Alinda, one of his Queen's maids of honor. He divorces his Queen on suborned testimony, banishes his friends, and holds even the Prince, his son, in suspicion. The Concubine becomes more and more exacting, demands her own father's head and the deaths of all her foes. While, on the other hand, the good Queen Eulalia, who is living in retirement, teaching young children, disarms all attempts against her life by her wifely obedience and her constant offer of good for evil. The conclusion is creditable to Brome's moral sense; for not only is Alinda sent repentant to a "house of convertites," but the King, too, retires to do penance for his wickedness, asking forgiveness of his wronged Queen and placing the Prince on his throne. Brome is alike less and more than a follower of Fletcher. Even in romance Brome never forgot the teachings of his ingenious master, Jonson. But ingenuity, industry, and honest senti-

*The Queen's Exchange*, 1632.

*Queen and Concubine*, after 1635.

[1] For the source of this tragedy in Greene's *Penelope's Web*, see Koeppel, *Quellen*, ii, 209.

ment, admirable as they all are, by no means fill out the equipment of a romantic artist. Considering their homeliness of style and absolute want of poetry, Brome's tragicomedies maintain a surprising amount of interest. They could not have failed to have offered the *habitué* of the commoner theaters of the age a coarse but wholesome dramatic diet.

Arthur Wilson, 1595–1652; his *Swizzer*, 1631, and *Inconstant Lady*, c. 1633.

If more ambitious and self-complacent, the tragicomedies of Arthur Wilson reaped no such popular success as those of Brome. Wilson was a gentleman in the service of the Earl of Essex and something of an adventurer in his way.[1] He entered Oxford as a student rather late in life and was reputed by a contemporary as of "little skill in the Latin tongue and less in the Greek," but of "a good readiness in French and some smattering of Dutch." [2] Wilson's three plays belong to the early thirties. *The Corporal* has been lost.[3] *The Swizzer*, which concerns intrigues of the court of old Lombardy, is a conspicuous example of the familiar composite drama of the age of Charles which Shirley compassed with genius but which lesser men commonly essayed with a wearisome repetition of the time-honored old furniture of the stage.[4] Thus, in the example before us we have

[1] See ed. of *The Inconstant Lady*, Oxford, 1814, Appendix II, p. 109, Wilson's own account of his life, entitled *Observations of God's Providence in the Tract of my Life*.

[2] Edward Bathurst's note prefixed to Wilson's *History of Great Britain*, 1653, the copy in the Library of Trinity College, quoted in the above, p. 156.

[3] From the *dramatis personae*, which is extant, the scene of this play appears to have been Lorraine.

[4] Feuillerat, *The Swizzer* (p. lxv, see below), finds the sources in Warnefridus, *De Gestis Langobardorum*, and in *The History of Italy*, by William Thomas, first published in 1549.

the lecherous tyrant; the love-lorn girl page; the banished lord, here the "Swizzer" or soldier of fortune; two old men of noble houses, enemies; their children, in love; poison evaded by the substitution of a sleeping potion; a fair captive generously treated by a chivalrous soldier, her captor; and the favorite "horror" of the moment, consanguinity a bar to virtuous love. There needs no great reading in old drama to reel off *Philaster*, *The Malcontent*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *Campaspe*, and *'Tis Pity* as the obvious "sources" for such inspiration. But it is more than likely that in all this such a writer as Wilson was doing little more than unconsciously employing what had become the veriest dramatic commonplaces of the age. *The Swizzer* is not bad, as such productions go. Wilson's other extant tragicomedy, *The Inconstant Lady*, is less ambitious and a better work. There is a fine spice of gentility about Aramant, who prefers his beloved to his property; and the intrigue by which his brother becomes the instrument of protection to the misused sister (who turns out a princess) and of restitution of his brother's fortune is well managed. Wilson writes lightly and in an easier blank verse than the average among the minor poets of his generation. He deserves the attention that he has recently received at the hands of an excellent young French scholar of English literature, but he deserves no more.[1]

Sir William Davenant, 1606-68.

It seems difficult to think of Sir William Davenant, poet-laureate of the Restoration and early rival of Dryden, as writing while Heywood and Rowley were still active, and Fletcher, revised by Massinger, was

[1] Cf. the Introduction to *The Swizzer*, edited by A. Feuillerat, Paris, 1904.

holding the stage. But Davenant began authorship early, was a playwright at twenty, and succeeded Jonson to the laureateship in 1638; so that the major part of his work, including his meritorious epic, *Gondibert*, falls before the accession of King Charles II.[1] Born in 1606, the son of an Oxford vintner who rose to the dignity of mayor of his native town, Davenant was intended for trade, but appears to have been diverted to literature when in the service of Lord Brooke, who is better remembered under the name of Fulke Greville, friend of Sidney and author of two notable Senecan tragedies.[2] It is hard to discover any actual literary influence of Greville on his young attendant. The old counselor's contact with the drama came to an end early in the reign of James with *Alaham* and *Mustapha*, and these exercises in statecraft in dramatic form claimed and possessed no kindred with actual plays. Davenant, on the other hand, was from the first a writer of plays for the stage. Each was subjected to influences emanating from France; but Greville was only remotely touched through Daniel with the Senecanism of Garnier and Jodelle, while the French influence on Davenant was mainly that of the preciosity of Mlle. de Scudéry and her like.

Davenant's earlier plays:

It is customary to dub Davenant "a limb of Fletcher;"[3] and to Fletcher, the chief influence in the

[1] His earliest poem, said to have been written at the age of eleven, is an *Ode* lamenting the death of his godfather, Shakespeare. See the edition of Davenant's Plays by Maidment and Logan, i, p. xxiii. For the gossip concerning Shakespeare's paternal relation to Davenant, see Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, ii, 43; and Aubrey, *Lives*, ed. A. Clark, 1898, i, 204.

[2] Above, pp. 10–14.

[3] Ward, iii, 169.

drama when he began to write, Davenant unquestionably owes much; but he was wanting neither in originality nor in versatility, and other influences, as we shall see, soon flowed in upon him. Of Davenant's masques and his early comedies, *The Just Italian*, *News from Plymouth*, and *The Wits*, we have already heard.[1] His earliest romantic plays are bloody and coarse in workmanship. *Albovine*, possibly written as early as 1626, details the horrible story of the mortal affront which that savage king of Lombards put upon his captive queen, Rodolinda, in pledging her health on their marriage night in a cup made of the skull of her father, whom he had defeated and slain.[2] The play seems a recrudescence of the old tragedy of blood, and suggests *Thierry and Theodoret* or *The Bloody Brother* as its inspiration. *The Cruel Brother*, 1627, is a tragedy of Italian court intrigue giving us in a *dramatis personae* which might be duplicated in any playwright of Fletcher's school, one personage, Foreste, whose nicely adjusted sense of honor demands that he kill his sister for falling a victim to lustful violence, though he spares his anointed sovereign, the cause of her fall. The age, from Fletcher up, abounds in dramatic exemplifications of that fallen adage, "the king can do no wrong;" but it rarely displays it in so frank an avowal as is this of *The Cruel Brother*. Fletcher had dared to kill on the stage the royal paramour of his Evadne.[3] It was

*Albovine*, 1626;

*The Cruel Brother*, 1627;

[1] Above, pp. 135, 136, 299–302.

[2] As to the source of *Albovine* in Paulus Diaconus, *De Gestis Langobardorum*, i, ch. 27; and ii, chs. 28–30, see K. Campbell, in *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iv, 20. This story forms, likewise, part of Middleton's *Witch*.

[3] *The Maid's Tragedy*, v, ii.

reserved for the polite Mr. Waller in a post-Restoration revival to revise this vigorous scene into one of noble reconciliation, lest its rigors should offend the sensibilities of the royal lover of Nell Gwynn.[1] *The Colonel*, 1629, is an excellent military drama alike for the serious plot in which a lady repudiates a suitor who has sacrificed his allegiance to his country for her love, and for the humorous action of Mervole, an ensign, who levies tribute on two coward volunteers and abuses them in a manner both original and diverting. *The Colonel* is superior in construction and for its diction to either of its forerunners. This circumstance and the elements of heroic disinterestedness which enter into the character of Bertolina, the heroine, especially, suggest that the play received considerable revision before it appeared as *The Siege* in the folio of Davenant's works, 1673.

*The Colonel*, 1629.

Between 1630 and 1634 Davenant suffered a period of severe illness. On his return to the stage his dramas take on a new color. *Love and Honor*, licensed in November, 1634,[2] *The Platonic Lovers*, a year later, and *The Fair Favorite*, 1638, form together Davenant's contribution in pre-Restoration times to the forebears of the heroic play.[3] As such they will

Davenant and the forebears of heroic drama.

[1] See Genest, i, 337; the prologue and two epilogues of this alteration find place in Waller's *Poems*, ed. G. Thorn Drury, 1893, 224–227. There is a copy of the altered version, bearing date 1690, in the Dyce collection.

[2] This play was first called *The Courage of Love*, secondly, *The Nonpareilles or Matchless Maids*, lastly *Love and Honor*.

[3] I exclude from this group *The Unfortunate Lovers*, from its tragic nature and concern with the deeper passions, although it must be confessed that, next to the three plays named in the text, it most nearly approaches the heroic ideal among the pre-Restoration dramas of Davenant.

require a closer scrutiny than their intrinsic merits might demand, the more particularly when we recall that by Dryden's express affirmation the invention of this species of drama is referred to his predecessor in the laureateship.[1]

*Love and Honor*, 1634.

In *Love and Honor*, Evandra, "heir of Millain," is captured in war by an impetuous young soldier, Prospero of Parma, and taken to Turin, where, in consequence of the Duke's determination to put her to death in retaliation for the supposed death of his brother at the hands of the Milanese, the princess is kept concealed from his fury. Alvarez, son of the Duke, Prospero, and Leonel (who with his sister Melora has been captured as well), are all devotedly and chivalrously attached to the Princess Evandra. Prospero is overwhelmed with remorse that he should have captured the lady, Leonel with humiliation that he could not have defended her. Alvarez vies with both in his efforts to effect her deliverance, and when he discovers that both Prospero and Leonel are in love with the Princess, as he is himself, exclaims:

> "O what a satisfied delight I feel
> When others in their love concur with mine!
> . . . . . .
> And we in that chief hope are wisely glad
> Of rivalship."

Nor are the ladies of the play less complete in their virtues than these paragons, their cavaliers. They succeed in entrapping two of the gentlemen in their cave of concealment, obtain the pledged word — a thing sacred and inviolable, no matter how extorted

[1] *Of Heroic Plays*, Scott-Saintsbury, *Dryden*, iv, 19. "For heroic plays, . . . the first light we had of them, on the English theatre, was from the late Sir William Davenant."

— of the third to keep them prisoners, and seek the Duke. In his presence, each lady claims to be the true Evandra; and the puzzled Duke, to be sure of his revenge, condemns them both to death. In the upshot, before Alvarez can raise the people against his father's tyranny, his uncle, supposedly dead, returns from Milan and the heroic ladies are saved. Reminded of a previous betrothal to Melora, which had slipped his memory, Alvarez honors his word like a gentleman, Evandra bestows her hand on faithful Leonel, and Prospero accepts the inevitable with a grace which only the heroic drama knows. In *The Fair Favorite* we have sentiment equally strained and lofty. A young king (whose domains, not otherwise determined, border upon Otranto) has, as a prince, long loved Eumena. On his return from the wars she is reported dead, and, after two years of mourning, the king is persuaded to marry for reasons of state. At his wedding Eumena appears. The King refuses to live with his Queen and returns to his first love, courting her with a lofty and ideal passion which she returns in kind. This novel situation gives rise to doubts and jealousy — as well it might — in Oramont, Eumena's brother, but raises for her a champion in the romantic Prince Amador, who visits the court to bring Oramont his ransom. In the end Eumena's virtue and pity for the Queen prevail to win the King to his wife's love, and Amador, whose impetuous generosity precipitates this *dénouement*, marries the fair favorite. There is dignity and elevation in this play and much discourse in the casuistry of heroic love.

*The Fair Favorite*, 1638.

Between these two plays of Davenant appeared *The Ladies' Privilege* by Henry Glapthorne, of whom

we had already heard among writers of comedies of manners and elsewhere.[1] Herein Chrisea, a haughty beauty, tests her lover's fidelity by bidding him court his friend for her, though in so doing she separates her own sister from her betrothed. The consequences of this situation bring Doria, the lover, into peril of his life for the supposed slaying of his friend. While the hauteur of the lady and the sensitive "honor" of Doria are of the true heroic type, the play fails towards the end in dignity because of the device of the ladies' privilege whereby Doria accepts his life on the request of an unknown beauty that she have him for a husband, and she turns out to be not Chrisea but his page masquerading as a girl. Glapthorne is always ambitious to be thought a poet, but here as elsewhere his success is indifferent.[2] Robert Mead's inferior college play, *The Combat of Love and Friendship*, about 1636, reproduces the situation of Chrisea and Dorea; but the lady loses her lover.

Glapthorne's *The Ladies' Privilege*, c. 1636.

It was in 1634, a few months prior to the performance of *Love and Honor*, that Davenant had prepared his most elaborate masque, *The Temple of Love*. This masque was a glorification of the court fad of the moment, Platonic love; and Queen Henrietta was apotheosized in it as the founder of the "new religion of love." This was deserved. For her majesty at the formative period of her life had been subject to the influences of the *salon* which the Marquise de Rambouillet had founded in protest against the rudeness of speech and manners which charac-

The cult of Platonic love.

[1] Above, i, p. 442; ii, pp. 278, 279.

[2] Three lost plays of Glapthorne are chronicled: *The Duchess of Fernandina*, *The Noble Trial*, and *The Vestal*. All were in Warburton's collection.

terized the French court of her time.[1] The English queen was thus in reality the leader of French preciosity in the court of her royal husband, whose delicate and romantic temper fell in naturally with the refinements of the new cult. "The reforms of the Hôtel de Rambouillet," writes a recent authority, "were directed principally toward two ends — the purification of the language and of the relations between the sexes, and its code-book in both matters was the preciously written love-encyclopedia in the form of a novel, *L'Astrée*, by Honoré D'Urfé." [2] That this work was the immediate inspiration of the cult of Platonic love in England need not be questioned, despite the fact that the whole matter is, in a sense, a recrudescence of medieval asceticism and chivalric love.[3] The extraordinary vogue of the Platonic cult in poetry, lyric as well as dramatic, in the prose of romance and of epistolary correspondence, need not detain us here. The *salons* of such ladies as the Duchess of Newcastle and the Countess of Carlisle, the letters of Sir John Suckling to the lady whom he addresses as Aglaura, and the lyrics of Waller to Lady Sidney, his Sacharissa, all are charged with Platonic love and analogous preciosity. As to the drama, as early as 1629 we find in Lady Frances

Platonic love in the drama.

[1] On this topic, see the excellent paper of Professor J. B. Fletcher, "Précieuses at the Court of Charles I," *Journal of Comparative Literature*, i, 125; and Professor W. A. Neilson, in *Harvard Studies*, vi.

[2] Professor Fletcher, as above, 132.

[3] See the older authorities on the subject V. Cousin, *La Société Française au XVII^e Siècle*, 1873, ii, 302; and Saint-Marc Girardin, *Cours de Littérature dramatique*, 1855, ii, 36, iii, 37. For an account of *L'Astrée* and kindred romances, see *Geschichte des französischen Romans*, H. Körting, 1891.

Frampul of Jonson's *New Inn* a true "Platonique" and "most Socratic lady," whose "humor" it is to regard "nothing a felicity, but to have a multitude of servants and be called mistress by them." [1] In a well-known letter of James Howell, dated Westminster, June 3, 1634, Platonic love is wittily described; and we are informed that "this love sets the wits of the town on work," [2] a statement abundantly proved, for example, in *Lady Alimony*, a curious satire in dramatic form wherein, mixed with much extraneous material, six "alimony ladies" are represented with their "Platonic confidants" and "cashiered consorts," with coarse but humorous and by no means ineffective stroke.

Davenant's *Platonic Lovers*, 1635.

But it is in Davenant's *Platonic Lovers* that the cult receives its chief dramatic exposition. This play has been well described as "a drama of love-debate." [3] Save for a paltry and improbable underplot, there is next to no action; but what there is proceeds by means of a series of subtle and "ingenious disputations for and against fruition of love in marriage." [4] The contrast of a pair of lovers who love platonically with a pair who love unaffectedly is not very well worked out, and although the discourses are high-flown and well-written, at times rising in their "soul-

[1] *The New Inn, dramatis personae*, Cunningham-Gifford, *Jonson*, v, 304. "Servants" is here *cavalieri serventi*, and "mistress," beloved.

[2] Howell, *Letters*, ed. 1890, ii, 230; *Lady Alimony* was printed in 1659, but plainly belongs to the thirties.

[3] Davenant must have found the unpleasing device by which the attempt on the virtue of Eurithea is defeated in Massinger's *Parliament of Love*, 1624, whither he may have gone for other suggestions.

[4] I am indebted in this estimate to several of Professor Fletcher's happy phrases.

ful converse" to the dignity of poetry, Davenant leaves the reader in no doubt as to his own decidedly agnostic attitude with respect to Platonic ideas. It is noteworthy that neither of the two remaining plays of Davenant which preceded the Restoration preserve in any degree the heroic ideals. *The Unfortunate Lovers*, licensed 1638, is a tragedy of purely Fletcherian type, but below its model in plotting, poetry, and improbability of action. *The Distresses*, which followed in the next year and is doubtless the same with *The Spanish Lovers* of the folio, is little more than the translation of a typical Spanish drama of cloak and sword.

The heroic play; its contrasts with heroical romance and true romantic drama.

It is something of a misfortune that Davenant should have dubbed his productions, such as *Love and Honor*, "heroique plays," [1] and that he should have given them this title when he had imparted to their salient features and mannerisms a degree of emphasis in his *Siege of Rhodes* which only his successors, Dryden, Orrery, and others surpassed. We have met with the heroic ideal in the drama again and again in these pages, and, without recapitulation, two major types are readily distinguishable. These may be best contrasted with the normal romantic drama in view, as each is but a species thereof. Thus, in the old heroical plays, such as *Common Conditions* or *The Four Prentices of London*, action and adventure count for everything and the interest revolves about the event. The method of these plays is that of hyperbole and dilation, and the exaggeration involved leads to the realization of the extraordinary and the supernatural.[2] Alphonsus levies

[1] Dedication to *The Siege of Rhodes*, folio of 1673.

[2] See above, i, pp. 198–205.

tribute on the kings of three continents; Tamburlaine conquers the world. Such is the hero superhuman. In true romantic drama the ruling force is passion, and passion can be portrayed only in a recognition and development of character. The method of the romantic drama is poetical, and exaggeration of personage and event is not one of its salient characteristics. Lear dies, a man overwhelmed with the might of human passion. The hero of romantic drama is the hero passionate. In the new heroic play, in place of the action of the old and the passion of romance, we have heightened sentiment; in place of event or character, analysis of conduct; in place of the hyperbole of poetry, too often inflated rhetoric. Exaggeration here leads not to the dilation of the supernatural, but to the humanly extraordinary and the amazing. Alvarez and Prospero in *Love and Honor* display a devotion, a courtesy, disinterestedness, and fidelity above the reach and understanding of ordinary men. The hero superhuman and the hero passionate have been displaced by the hero supersensitive, by "the paragon of virtue and the pattern of noble conduct." The themes of the heroic drama are "honor won by valor" and "valor inspired by love." "Its rivalries are rivalries in nobility of soul;" its combats, less those of the sword than those of fortitude, loyalty, and the sacrifice to honor and plighted word.

Sources of the heroic play:

It is easy to take such a play as Dryden's *Conquest of Granada* or his *Aureng-Zebe*, tabulate its qualities, dilate on the character of "heroic verse," and exclude all dramas which differ from this completed type from the category of its species. In literature no type springs, like Minerva, full armed from the head of Jove. Hence a consideration of the

"heroic" elements in the drama of the reign of King Charles should logically take count of the many separate characteristics which, combined, produced this particular product.[1] Now its personages of exalted rank, its antique scene in a land exotic if not indeterminate geographically, with its pseudo-historical background of war, conflict, and intrigue, the heroic drama inherited direct from the tragicomedy of Fletcher. Its direction of the romantic spirit towards the illustration of the personal qualities of valor, generosity, and courtesy was likewise presaged in Fletcher and Massinger, for example, in Miranda, the pattern of knightly virtue in *The Knight of Malta*, in the contest for military honors between father and son in *The Laws of Candy*, and in the similar contest in courtesy on which turns the whole conception of *Royal King and Loyal Subject*.[2] Under the immediate influence of French romance and preciosity just described, this romantic spirit was strung to a higher key, and its dominant tone became heroic passion, its falsetto note Platonic love. The first is the theme of that interesting play of Fletcher's already described, *The Lovers' Progress*, 1623; the second, Massinger failed to comprehend in his *Parliament of Love* licensed in the following year; [3] though, as

(1) the tragicomedy of Fletcher;

[1] On this topic in general, see the suggestive paper of my friend and colleague, Professor C. G. Child, "The Rise of the Heroic Play," *Modern Language Notes*, xix, 166–173, to which I am much indebted; and also "The Relation of the Heroic Play to the Romances of Beaumont and Fletcher," by J. W. Tupper, *ibid.* xx, 584–621. *The English Heroic Play*, by L. N. Chase, 1903, is concerned with the type in its completeness and deals with its contrasts rather than with its resemblances to earlier drama.

[2] For an account of these plays, see above, pp. 220–227.

[3] Above, pp. 227, 254, 255.

we have already seen, Jonson had ridiculed its absurdity but five years later and almost before it had taken its actual hold on the society of his time. But further, the method of heroic drama is largely that of heightened contrast, a method confessedly introduced into English drama by Beaumont and Fletcher; while if any distinction is to be drawn between the plot construction of these authors and that of the writers of heroic plays, the influence of the French prose romances on the heroic drama must be acknowledged in their greater want of unity, their amplification of merely theatrical incident, and their general unknitting of the closer structure of earlier drama. A reduction in the number of the *dramatis personae* has sometimes been claimed as a distinctive characteristic of the heroic play.[1] But this likewise was a virtue of Shirley. We have, too, hyperbolic diction used in heroic drama as a method of all work; but this, too, was abundantly exampled, more wisely employed, in nearly any romantic drama of the earlier age. Lastly, we have the tardy return to dialogue couched in couplets, in which heroic drama merely shared in what had become the fashion of the verse of the day. From this discussion we may infer that the particular form of decadent romanticism which we term the heroic play was a product of the romance and preciosity of D'Urfé, Mlle. de Scudéry, and their like, introduced into England by Queen Henrietta Maria and rendered fashionable at court, working on tragicomedies degenerated from the type introduced by *Philaster*. And, with due deference to this foreign influence, we may agree that, none the less, "the drama of the Restoration would in the natural course

(2) Fletcher's method of heightened contrast;

(3) Shirley's simplified plot;

(4) the contemporary fashion of couplets;

(5) the example of French "romances."

[1] L. N. Chase, *The English Heroic Play*, 42, 43.

of evolution have been produced out of the elements already developed on the stage, even without the intervention of French models." [1]

Davenant not the typical exponent of the heroic play.

Davenant holds in some respects a place of fortuitous prominence in the development of the heroic play by reason of two things, — his conspicuous position as the predecessor of Dryden, and, secondly, his later services in the development of the more purely formal elements of the species as practiced after Restoration times. If we leave these special matters of aftergrowth out of our consideration, the typical exponent before the Restoration of the contemporary heroic romance dramatized is not Sir William Davenant but, in the first instance, Lodowick Carlell, whose ten years of dramatic activity were passed in the very heart of the English court, and, secondly, Thomas Killigrew, whose life abroad exposed him to more direct French influences of the kind. Davenant was, after all, eclectic in the practice of his profession before the Restoration of Charles. He followed largely, if not wholly, the line of English theatrical tradition. As for Killigrew, he knew nothing but the comedy of manners brutalized and heroic romance on French models. Carlell knew only the latter.

Lodowick Carlell, 1602–75;

Lodowick Carlell was born in 1602 and came of the border stock of the Carlyles of Brydekirk, the stock that gave to the nineteenth century the memorable name of Thomas Carlyle.[2] As a younger son, Lodowick left his country early to seek advancement

[1] J. A. Symonds in *Academy*, March 21, 1874.

[2] I prefer to follow the title-pages of Carlell's plays, as in the case of Shakespeare, for the spelling of his name. He seems to have signed his name Carliell and otherwise. *Lodowick Carliell*, by C. H. Gray, Chicago, 1905, p. 11.

at court. This he received, rising through several offices in the king's household to be one of the two royal keepers of the great Forest at Richmond, a post which he retained throughout the period of the Commonwealth and until his death in August, 1675. His life at court made Carlell a playwright. He writes always with the refinement and intimate knowledge of the courtier and in full sympathy with the exalted and impracticable ideals of contemporary romance. In short, it would be difficult to find any author more completely the man of the moment than Carlell. His work, save for a post-Restoration translation of the *Heraclius* of Corneille, belongs to the last dozen years of the old drama; and it varies not a whit from the precise standard of his own making. Carlell's earliest effort was *The Deserving Favorite*, acted at Whitehall in 1629 and "not designed," writes the author, "to travel so far as the common stage." [1] The plot is an intricate one, like all of Carlell's, though it is well-constructed and consistently sustained. The story turns on a struggle between love and duty on the part of Lysander, who owes his life to the Duke but is secretly betrothed to the very lady whom the Duke is seeking for his wife. It has been recently shown that this plot is derived from a well-known Spanish "novel," *La Duquesa de Mantua*, by Don Alonso del Castillo Solorzano, published in the same year.[2] An allusion by Thomas Dekker to Carlell's knowledge of Spanish makes this ascription certain.[3] The next two tragicomedies of Carlell disclose in a minor particular their paternity in the lengthy material

his plays: *The Deserving Favorite*, 1629.

[1] Dedication to *The Deserving Favorite*, Gray, p. 72.

[2] *Ibid.* 57–60.

[3] *Ibid.* 63, quoting Dekker's *Match Me in London.*

of contemporary romance, albeit their precise sources have not yet been discovered, as both were capable of representation on the stage only in two parts forming really a continuous drama, in each case, of ten acts. *Arviragus and Philicia*, acted at the Cockpit and before the king at Whitehall and Hampton Court, has already claimed a casual mention from the accident that its scene is laid in old Britain.[1] The work is purely of heroic-romantic cast, the story of the devoted friendship and extraordinary adventures of Arviragus and Guiderius and of the heroic passion and generosity of the Danish Princess Cartandes. Although nearly the entire range of Fletcherian personages appears, — the tyrant king, heroic prince, faithful friend, sage counselor, imperious princess, and the steadfast maid, Philicia, — the last in the inevitable masquerade of doublet and hose, — yet this tragicomedy discloses great variety of situation, involving the display of the usual heroic virtues in the highest tension. Nor can we deny a certain theatrical distinction to these impossible figures. It would be interesting to know Carlell's source, if source he had, still more interesting to know the process by which the courtier-dramatist became possessed of the Shakespeare-resonant names, Arviragus and Guiderius.

*Arviragus and Philicia*, 1636.

*The Passionate Lovers*, likewise in two parts and also presented before the king and at Blackfriars, is a less able production. The story hinges on the rivalry of two princes, sons of the King of "Burgony," for the love of Clarinda, their cousin, and the keynote of the play is "love without the possibility of satisfaction." A characteristic scene is that in which the younger brother relinquishes his crown to the elder,

*The Passionate Lovers*, c. 1636.

[1] Above, i, p. 303.

whom he has captured in war and whom he immediately challenges to mortal combat to redress the grievances between them. The heroic spirit is present in the conception of the characters, if not always in the language; and the "chaste restraint" of the ladies smacks unmistakably of the prevalent Platonic notions. In *The Fool would be a Favorite or The Discreet Lover*, Carlell continued his heroic, adventurous vein. The plot here is both intricate and inventive. The hero, Philautus, loves successively two ladies and is loved by one of these and a third. He encounters a rival as an unknown champion and worsts him, besides fighting a duel with his best friend on a punctilio of honor. A Moor figures in this play but takes no important part, and the hero's impersonation of his own ghost to effect a species of testamentary union between a lady who insists on loving him, and his dearest friend, who insists on loving her, must be pronounced glaringly artificial even among the artificialities of degenerate heroic romance. The remaining play of Carlell is *Osmond the Great Turk*, already described, from its slender basis in history, among the plays of its immediate type.[1] Osmond is the veritable pattern of virtue in a Constantinople as unreal as the author's "Burgony," Utranto, or England. But the comparative brevity of *Osmond* and its tragic ending in events not unlike those of Greville's *Mustapha* and the anonymous *Revenge for Honor*, impart to it a tone of compactness not that of the rambling adventures of Carlell's other tragicomedies.[2] All of Carlell's plays are writ-

*The Fool would be a Favorite, c.* 1638.

[1] Above, i, p. 449.

[2] A lost tragicomedy of Carlell, entitled *The Spartan Ladies*, is mentioned in the manuscript *Diary* of Sir Henry Mildmay, *Harleian MS.* 454. See Gray, 35.

ten in a degenerate mixture of blank verse and prose which, though easy and natural in flow, is too fiberless for good verse and too rhythmical for successful prose. There are passages in which Carlell is not wanting in eloquence, and he is often dramatically effective in scenes and situations; but to claim poetry for any part of these productions is to claim too much. All of Carlell's plays seem to have been popular in their day. *Arviragus* was revived after the Restoration and offered up with a prologue by the great Dryden.[1] But it must have shown loose and abortive beside the compact rhetorical glories of the great laureate of the Restoration; for all of Carlell's dramas mark a structural, imaginative, and poetical degeneracy from their great model, Fletcher.

Thomas Killigrew, 1612–83;

The three pre-Restoration tragicomedies of Thomas Killigrew correspond in type precisely with the works of Carlell, and vie with them in the overplus of their adventure, heroic dialogue, and sentiment, and in a general looseness of style and plot. Killigrew was reared a page in the court of Charles I and continued a favorite companion of his son. Killigrew appears to have written his earlier plays while abroad between 1635 and 1640.[2] His later theatrical career falls without the limits of this book. *Claracilla* sets forth a palace intrigue in a nondescript ancient country at enmity with Rhodes, wherein the Princess Claracilla is rescued from a usurper by an ingenious counterplot of the Princess' lover and his friends. *The Prisoners* introduces us to a melodramatic pirate, Gillippus, who holds nobles as his slaves and kidnaps princesses. The locus is Sardinia and several scenes,

his tragicomedies, 1635–40.

[1] This was in 1672 ; see Genest, i, 133.

[2] See Fleay, ii, 24, as to the dates of these plays.

take place at sea.[1] Although the action is too brisk for long disputation, the heroic ideal is maintained not only in the general conception of the characters and their relations to each other, but in such a debate as that of the two noble-slaves as to whether it is honorable to betray their master's trust in them or drag a fair captive into servitude.[2] In *The Princess* is related the adventures of Cicilia, Princess of Sicily, and Sophia, sister to "Virgilius, son to Julius Cæsar." Cicilia is sold as a slave in Naples' mart, is restored to her brother, the King of Sardinia, and, after long siege, is won to marry Virgilius, enemy to her country. Sophia scarcely fulfills the demands of her extraordinary kinship. This play is pervaded by the heroic spirit. Cilius, especially, is a type of the noble self-denying hero. The scene of recognition between brother and sister and that wherein Cicilia weighs the claims of her love for Virgilius with her love of country are not without merit in their kind.[3] Killigrew's tragicomedies are adequately written in the lilting verse-prose which Carlell employs, and he is equally devoid of a scintilla of poetry. The circumstance that his *Cicilia and Clorinda or Love in Arms*, one of the earliest of his post-Restoration tragicomedies, is from the first book of *Le Grand Cyrus* sufficiently discloses the general inspiration of these, his earlier "romances."

A few other plays of this adventurous romantic

[1] Cf. the many examples of this in older drama. *Fortunes by Land and Sea*, *The Fair Maid of the West*, and especially Fletcher's *Double Marriage*, which may have furnished Killigrew suggestions.

[2] *The Prisoners*, I, i, leaf 18, ed. 1641.

[3] See, especially, *The Princess*, IV, vi; *Works of Thomas Killigrew*, folio 1664, p. 42.

type synchronize with the period of the activity of Carlell and Thomas Killigrew. Among them is a lengthy and curiously incoherent production by Henry Killigrew, younger brother of Thomas, prepared for a noble marriage and entitled *The Conspiracy*, printed in 1638 as *Palantius and Eudora*, and actually given a public performance at Blackfriars. According to one authority, this was "the first English play publicly acted with scenery," an extraordinary statement, the precise meaning of which it is difficult to make out.[1] There was a third and elder brother of Thomas and Henry, Sir William Killigrew, and his several plays — such as *Selindra*, *Love and Friendship*, and *The Siege of Urbin* — carry on the traditions of this variety of tragicomedy, though there is nothing to show that any one of them was acted or even written before the Restoration. An unquestionable if extravagant specimen of the degenerate prose romance dramatized is *The Phœnix in Her Flames*, printed in 1639 and the work of Sir William Lower, later the adapter of several French plays of Corneille, Scarron, and Quinault.[2] *The Phœnix* relates the wanderings in Arabia of Amandus, Prince of Damascus, who has been deprived of his city by Tartars. He is captured by robbers who have likewise in their power a fair Princess of Egypt whom Amandus preserves, but against whose amorous blandishments he is proof because he has fallen in love with a picture of the fair Phænecia, Princess of Arabia. In the end he

Henry Killigrew's *The Conspiracy*, 1634.

Lower's *The Phœnix in Her Flames*, c. 1639.

[1] Fleay, ii, 23. On this topic, the employment of scenery, see above, i, pp. 171–177.

[2] See Langbaine, 332, who relates that Lower, "during the heat of our Civil Wars, took sanctuary in Holland." Lower was of Tremare, Cornwall, and died in 1662.

meets Phænicia, and after killing her father's enemy, King Perseus of Persia, unhappily expires of wounds received in that encounter. As for the Arabian Princess, she dies, like the Phœnix, smothered in the fumes of sweet incense.[1] *The Strange Discovery* by John Gough, written before 1640, has already been described as a dramatic version of *Theagenes and Chariclea* of Heliodorus.[2] It is of much the same extravagant type, and wanders from Egypt to Greece and thence to Ethiopia in a straggling series of scenes devoid of any real plotting.

Recrudescence of heroical romance.

It cannot have escaped the reader that the dramatized romance of the reign of King Charles sought its effect not only by the delicate aroma that exhales from high-strung emotion, but by the more sanctioned methods of a surfeit of adventure. *The Phœnix in her Flames*, though well enough written, is as crude in its way as *Common Conditions*, and far less interesting because far less naïve.[3] As might be expected, such productions as *The Phœnix* and *The Strange Discovery* led to a recrudescence of the ruder earlier type of heroical romance, precisely as the popularity of prose romance begot a renewed output of the degenerate versions of old story in the shape of chapbooks and broadside ballads. It is of interest to note that productions such as *The Four Prentices*, such as *Chinon of England* and *Charlemagne*, ceased to hold the stage after the first decade of the reign of King James until the two or three revivals, at this late date, about to be noted.[4] Such a production is *The*

[1] *The Phœnix*, quarto, 1639, M2. [2] Cf. above, p. 48.

[3] As to *Common Conditions* and the plays of its type, see above, i, p. 199.

[4] For these early dramatized romances, see above, i, pp. 202–205.

*Guy Earl of Warwick*, pr. 1639.

*Tragical History of Guy Earl of Warwick*, written by B. J. (whom it is needless to say was not Ben Jonson), printed in 1639 and again in 1661. This "dolent history," as it is described, tells with happy embellishment the well-known tale of its hero, whom it glorifies absurdly in the good old fashion, and throws into consort not only with Paynims and giants, but likewise with Oberon, king of fairies.[1] Even more preposterous is *The Seven Champions of Christendom*, "acted at the Cockpit and at the Red Bull (in 1634), and never printed till the year 1638," by John Kirke. This play opens in the cave of Calib, a witch who is visited by Tarpax, the devil. George, discovering that these personages have killed his father, "heir to great Coventry," overwhelms them and sets free six champions whom they have kept in thrall. The seven knights now take oath that they will repress enchantment, kill Mahometans, and redress the wrongs of distressed ladies. The scene wanders from Trebizond, which is infested with dragons, to Tartary, where "devils run laughing over the stage." There is much marginal thunder and lightning interspersed with soft music. George fights each champion in turn and beats him, and the play ends at a castle in Macedon, where seven swans are changed to fair maidens to wed the seven champions. Romance could run no wilder.[2]

Kirke's *The Seven Champions*, 1634.

Returning to less extravagant specimens of later

[1] It is impossible to identify so naïve a production as this with the play of the same title registered in 1620 as by Day and Dekker, and alluded to by Taylor the Water Poet in 1618 as acted by Lord Derby's men. *Penniless Pilgrimage*, *Works of Taylor*, ed. Spenser Society, 1869, i, 140.

[2] Neither of these productions has been reprinted.

romantic drama, the later thirties witness, besides the maturer triumphs of Shirley and the romances just described, the tragicomedies of Cartwright, from their slender touch with the classics and the performance of the most notable of them at Oxford, already noticed;[1] the two lost comedies, *The Soldier* and *The Scholar* by Richard Lovelace, the darling of his age; and the several dramatic endeavors of that witty, original, and hare-brained trifler, Sir John Suckling. Suckling was born in 1609, the son of the controller of the royal household, who died in 1627, leaving the young poet a large fortune. Suckling was educated at Cambridge, was of the same circle as Carew, Lovelace, and Nabbes, and particularly intimate with Davenant and "the ever-memorable" John Hales, from whom he may have acquired the enthusiastic regard in which he held the memory of Shakespeare. A spendthrift and gambler for high stakes, Suckling lived his short day, foremost among the wits and roistering cavaliers of the days preceding the war. But although his reputation for valor was impeached, he maintained the friendship of King Charles and the regard of several serious-minded men. Suckling's prodigality put his first play, *Aglaura*, on the stage in 1637, more sumptuously furnished and costumed than any before its time. The same trait caused him to furnish the king in 1639 for his disastrous Scottish campaign, a contingent of a hundred horse accounted at a cost, it was said, of £12,000.[2] A discovery of the prominent part which Suckling played in a plan to secure for the king the control of the army and to liberate Strafford from the

Other late romantic dramas.

Sir John Suckling, 1609–42.

[1] Above, pp. 46–48, 90.

[2] Aubrey, ii, 241, 244; Langbaine, 497.

Tower drove Suckling into exile, and he ended his life by suicide in Paris in the spring of 1642. *Aglaura*, a somewhat gloomy tragedy of court intrigue, laid as to scene in an impossible Persia, has already claimed our attention among the pseudo-historical plays that follow in the wake of the historical drama on foreign annals.[1] Into this incongruous scene Suckling obtruded Semanthe, a "Platonique" lady, though less is made of the rôle than we might have expected from the author of the Platonic letters to which allusion has already been made.[2] It was for this play that Suckling wrote a final act ending happily, the only example of such an alternative act in the drama of old time.[3] *The Sad One*, also a tragedy, is a mere skeleton or sketch of a play as we have it, intended to turn on no unusual intrigue in the court of Sicily. *The Goblins*, written about 1638, is an original and sprightly production, full of action and intrigue, in which figure certain merry outlaws who masquerade, disguised as devils, as much for their diversion as for gain. Several time-honored situations figure in this comedy — two noble families at variance, for example, and a prince in love with a maiden whom he relinquishes to her lover to solve an apparent *impasse*. *The Goblins* may not impossibly have been conceived in the nature of a parody on the deadly serious tragicomedies of his contemporaries: for such was the temper of Suckling. However, in *Brennoralt or the Discontented Colonel*, 1639, Suck-

*Aglaura*, 1637.

*The Goblins*, 1638.

*Brennoralt*, 1639.

[1] Above, i, p. 450.

[2] Above, p. 346.

[3] Cf. i, p. 450, and note the later parallel case of a double fifth act in Sir Robert Howard's *Vestal Virgin*, printed in 1665. See Langbaine, 277.

ling was thoroughly serious, and produced, as a result, his best dramatic work. *Brennoralt* is ably planned and well written, full of action, and not wanting in characterization, especially of its gloomy Byronic hero.[1] Almost alone of these latest playwrights of the reign of Charles has Suckling actual distinction of style, a happy informing wit, gnomic wisdom, and power to rise, on occasion, into genuinely poetic imagery. And yet, hampered by the conventions of the decadent art of his day, Suckling is not truly dramatic. For in *Brennoralt* on the background of an unhistorical Polish rebellion recur the familiar heroic figures, the noble adversary, the lady infatuated with a youth who turns out to be the inevitably recurrent pathetic masquerader of her own sex. The play, too, is but half a tragedy, as in the end Brennoralt, of whom we might have expected an heroic suicide, remains alive, though broken in spirit with the deaths that his fatal hand has dealt. In view of contemporary events of the moment the political attitude of Brennoralt is of no little interest. He is "discontented," but loyal; and resents the inference that anything could "tempt his honor." "Dost think," he exclaims,

> "'cause I am angry with
> The king and state sometimes, I am
> Fallen out with virtue and myself?"

[1] As to the heroic note in this play, see the words of Brennoralt, III, i, p. 110:

> "I will raise honor to a point
> It never was — do things of such
> A virtuous greatness, she shall love me.
> . . . . . I will deserve her
> Although I have her not."

Elsewhere he adds:

> "Religion
> And liberty (most specious names) they urge:
> Which like the bills of subtle mountebanks,
> Filled with great promises of curing all, though by
> The wise passed by as common cosenage,
> Yet by the unknowing multitude they're still
> Admired and flocked unto." [1]

Such in general was the attitude of the contemporary dramatist towards the momentous questions that were hurrying England to civil war and regicide.

Minor romantic dramas of the later years of King Charles.

The scattering minor dramas of a romantic cast which were written in the last few years of King Charles' reign conform almost absolutely to the general mode and defy classification as to their minor characteristics. A larger proportion of them are tragic than are earlier plays of the reign, and in some we mark a recurrence to the strong stimulants of the tragedy of blood and horror. Such is the melodramatic *Fatal Contract*, 1637, of William Heming, son of the fellow-actor of Shakespeare, in which a wronged woman compasses her revenge in the novel disguise of a court eunuch; [2] and such, too, is the intricate and overwrought *Sicily and Naples*, 1640, by Samuel Harding, wherein the disguise of a Moor — favorite device of the moment — is similarly em-

*Imperiale*, 1639.

ployed. [3] *Imperiale*, by Ralph Freeman, recurs to Senecan methods and devices to produce its genuinely powerful effect. There is something truly heroic in the story of Molosso, the wronged slave, and his complete and outrageous revenge, wrought in sight of the

[1] *Brennoralt*, III, i, *Works of Suckling, Library of Old Authors*, ii, 104–105.

[2] Cf. above, i, p. 426, for a fuller account of this production.

[3] Above, i, p. 410.

now helpless master who had wronged him.[1] *The Rebellion* by Thomas Rawlins, medalist in the Royal Mint, tells a more pleasing tale of a noble gentleman disguised as a tailor, and uses to the full all the old romantic devices of disguise, bandits, rescues, visions, and what not. John Tatham's inferior *Distracted State* is another "Sicilian history" of which Genest remarks that "the plot answers well to the title;" [2] whilst George Cartwright's *Heroic Lover or the Infanta of Spain* offers nothing in its Polish scene that need detain even the most conscientious student, and a trial of Nabbes' *Unfortunate Mother*, "refused by the actors," will uphold the justice of the words of the editor of Nabbes that it "hardly allows itself to be read." [3] *Andromana, The Merchant's Wife*, by J. S., who was not James Shirley, is a well-written dramatic version of the story of Plangus in Sidney's *Arcadia*, which furnished Fletcher with the major plot of *Cupid's Revenge*. *The Marriage Night* is by Henry Cary, Viscount Falkland, who lived until 1663, and not by Lucius, his son, whose untimely death in 1643 was deplored by so many who were destined themselves to fall in the royal cause. Neither of these tragicomedies was certainly written before 1642.[4]

Last romantic comedies.

Romantic comedies were few in these last years. *The Amorous War* by Jasper Mayne is a lively and

[1] This play is not to be confused with *The Imperial Tragedy*, published anonymously in 1669, and thought by Langbaine to be by Sir William Killigrew. This latter concerns the life of the Emperor Zeno, and falls, with all its accumulated horrors, without our period.

[2] Genest, x, 75.

[3] Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s. i, p. xvii.

[4] See Ward, iii, 336, for parallels to Shakespeare and Tourneur which he finds in this play.

somewhat extravagant play in which, by means of a pretended conquest by Amazons, certain ladies of Bythynia test the bravery and the fidelity of their husbands and lovers. The idea seems suggested, like that of Cartwright's *Lady Errant*, by some of the scenes of Fletcher's *Sea Voyage*. Of the same year, 1639, is Alexander Brome's sprightly and attractive comedy, *The Cunning Lovers*, wherein an eccentric duke, Prospero of Verona, locks up his daughter in an impregnable tower; but is outwitted and deluded by the cleverness of the lover and his friends with devices which smack of the supernatural but are really simplicity itself.[1] Alexander Brome was a writer of songs of some merit and publisher of the plays of his namesake, Richard Brome, to whom he tells us explicitly he was not related.[2] Francis Quarles, serious religious poet that he was, and famous as the writer of *Emblems*, left behind him a single play entitled *The Virgin Widow*, which "the stationer" informs the reader was "sometimes at Chelsea privately acted by a company of young gentlemen." A first edition of this "comedy" was printed in 1649, five years after the death of Quarles. *The Virgin Widow* is a very amateurish performance and curiously free from the prevailing theatrical conventions. A fair maid, married to a despicable usurer, and an honorable King, father of three sons and husband

*The Virgin Widow*, by Quarles.

[1] This story in slightly different form is found in the Latin *Historia septem sapientium Romæ*, the thirteenth tale. See *The Seven Sages*, *Percy Society's Publications*, xvi, p. lxiv; a medieval metrical version is given at page 94. Cf. also, the tale called "The Two Dreams," in *The Seven Wise Masters*, G. Ellis, *Early English Metrical Romances*, ed. 1868, p. 442.

[2] *On the Comedies of Richard Brome*, prefixed to *Five New Plays*, 1659.

of a wicked Queen, are platonically attached. The usurer dies of poison sent by the Queen, and a stroke of divine lightning destroys the royal family, save for the King, who marries at once the maid, wife, and widow, thus fulfilling an oracle. There is much low comedy of an innocent kind to fill up the slender main story. The play is well written, but it is difficult to believe it other than an early production of its serious author.

Berkeley's *The Lost Lady*, pr. 1639.

*The Lost Lady* of Sir William Berkeley, subsequently governor of Virginia, is highly praised by Ward, but he miscalls the hero and mistakes the disguise of the "lady." [1] The novel plot of this tragicomedy, which is well sustained although the exposition is decidedly obscure, details the nightly devotions of Prince Lysicles of Thessaly before the tomb of his beloved, Milisia, whom he believes to have been murdered; and how in the disguise of a female Moor that lady tests and proves his devotion, despite appearances which result from the generosity of Lysicles to an absent friend. That charming and vivacious young woman of Commonwealth times, Mistress Dorothy Osborne, who became the wife of Sir William Temple, gives us a delightful touch of the reality of these old plays in one of her letters. "They will have me," she gossips, "at my part in a play; 'The Lost Lady' it is, and I am she. Pray God it be not an ill omen." [2] This play has all the preternatural seriousness of the heroic spirit; and

[1] Ward, iii, 163. *The Lost Lady* was printed in 1639.

[2] *Letters from Dorothy Osborne to Sir William Temple*, edited by E. A. Parry, p. 304. The editor's idea that Dorothy played the rôle of Hermione is incorrect, as Hermione is neither the heroine nor "the lost lady."

we cannot but wonder, when "the lost lady," with blackened face, is ill of the potion hastily administered by her loyal but mistaking Lysicles, and her face is laved with water thereby disclosing her identity, did witty Mistress Dorothy retain her gravity? [1]

Habington's *Cleodora*, 1640.

In 1640 *Cleodora, the Queen of Aragon*, was staged both at court and at Blackfriars with great expense. The author was William Habington, author of *Castara*, a collection of lyrical poetry of considerable if fastidious merit and an historian of note. *The Queen of Aragon* is a play of elevated and refined sentiment, by no means ineffective in its chief characters, which consist of the Queen and her three lovers, two warring generals, and the King of Castile. A fine heroic tone pervades the whole production, and it is neither wanting in poetry nor in independence of thought. Another play of a Queen of Aragon was given to the press in Commonwealth times by Alexander Gough and doubtless belongs to times previous to the closing of the theaters. It was entitled *The Queen or the Excellency of her Sex*, and the plot concerns the sudden fortune of Alphonso raised from the block to be king, his pride and the devotion of his Queen. This play has been thought Ford's, and is not unlikely the work of a dramatist of note. With the chronicling of *The Noble Stranger* by Lewis Sharp, an obvious plot of a prince disguised, not altogether badly told, and of *The Just General* by Major Cosmo Manuche, still another "Sicilian history" printed in Commonwealth times, our tale of the romantic dramas of the reign of King Charles I comes to an end.

[1] This incredible scene may be found by the doubting in Dodsley, Hazlitt's ed. xii, 609, 610. A play called *Cornelia*, by Berkeley, appears to have been acted after the Restoration. Fleay, i, 28.

Puritan attack on the stage and final suppression of performances, 1642.

The Puritan spirit of the Parliaments of King Charles is patent in a statute of the very first year of his reign which forbids "the acting of interludes and common plays on Sunday." [1] In the following year, 1626, a petition for the building of an amphitheater in Lincoln's Inn Fields failed when it was discovered that theatrical performances were to be given therein.[2] The notorious Nathaniel Giles, too, — who seems to have carried on his traffic of furnishing boys to the stage for some thirty years, — was finally forbidden to supply any of the children of the royal chapel for the acting of stage plays, "for that it is not fitt or desent that such should sing the praises of God Almighty."[3] In 1631 the Puritans had become bolder, and a petition was presented to the Bishop of London by the inhabitants of Blackfriars demanding the removal of the playhouse there. They recalled the ancient prohibition of a playhouse within the city, and complained of its interference with traffic, trade, and church worship. But nothing came of this petition.[4] A year or two later followed Prynne's offense, his trial and condemnation, of which enough has been said. In 1636 and 1637 the playhouses were closed for a month on account of the plague; and in 1640 an order was issued to suppress the players, although

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 342; and see Hazlitt, *Documents*, 59.

[2] Fleay, *Stage*, 343; Collier, ii, 11–15, where it appears that this was the renewal of a petition of 1620.

[3] *Ibid.* 16. This prohibition appears as a clause in a warrant of the privy seal authorizing Giles, as formerly, to take up singing boys for the chapel royal.

[4] Fleay, *Stage*, 344; and see Collier, ii, 34–36, for some quaint punishments put upon the participants for their part in a performance of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream* at the house of the Bishop of Lincoln in this same year.

this document, one of Collier's finds, has been suspected.[1] At length, in September, 1642, came the ordinance of the Lords and Commons, putting a cease to the performance of all plays on account of the civil war; and several further ordinances were passed to complete the suppression. The final one of February, 1647, declared all players rogues within the meaning of the old statutes of Elizabeth and James, authorized the mayor, justices, and sheriffs to dismantle all playhouses, assigned whipping as the punishment for an actor caught pursuing his calling, fined each spectator five shillings, and turned over the door money to the relief of the poor.[2]

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 365; Collier, ii, ed. 1879, p. 34.

[2] *Ibid.* ii, 36–50; where these ordinances and the manner in which they were carried out is discussed. See, also, Hazlitt, *Documents*, 63–70, where the texts of these statutes are reprinted.

# XX

## THE DRAMA IN RETROSPECT

Census of plays written between 1558 and 1642.

OUR structure is now complete, and we may demolish the scaffolds with some little pause in the process. It is related that Malone, a competent judge, once estimated the total output of plays on the London stage between the accession of Queen Elizabeth and the closing of the theaters at something like two thousand.[1] In view of the large number of plays which must have perished and left not even their titles behind them, this estimate cannot be considered excessive. And yet, when we come to an actual census of the material at hand,—plays extant, in print or still in manuscript, plays entered for printing in the Stationers' Register and otherwise recorded or alluded to,—the sum total rises scarcely to sixteen hundred; and to eke out this we must include a hundred and thirty university plays, Latin and English, a hundred and forty masques and entertainments, and between thirty and forty city pageants, productions, all of them dramatical, but, like the translations of foreign plays (likewise included), only

[1] I do not find this estimate in any of Malone's published works. Fleay, in his *Life of Shakespeare*, 356, gives precisely this figure, and reduces it to the unnecessarily low number 1320 (in his *History of the Stage*, 254) between 1587 and 1641. Fleay bases his estimate on the forty-two plays of Herbert's list in eighteen months of 1622–23, and subtracting six old plays, gets an average of twenty-four new plays per year. The activity of the hey-day of Henslowe must certainly have been greater.

to be classed as true dramas with a certain latitude and indulgence. To one who has never had occasion to work with material such as this, a complete and satisfactory list, including every dramatic production between two definite dates, must seem a matter of simple enumeration. But several considerations enter into such a count to complicate it and to render any result merely approximate. There is, for example, uncertainty as to the actual dates of plays at the beginning and at the end of the period; the date of publication, performance, and even of mention being frequently misleading. There is uncertainty, again, as to the identity of the same play, revived, as it often was, under a totally different title, or as to the actual difference of plays (when one or both are lost) of the same or of similar titles. There is doubt as to whether some registrations and mentions actually refer to plays or to productions of another kind; and there is question as to the extent of revision which should be taken to constitute a new play. And yet with all these doubts and with liberal allowances and deductions there remain at the very least twelve hundred titles of English plays written within these eighty-five years, all save a very few of which were staged and more than half of which were so approved by their time that they were acted again and again, printed, sometimes in many editions, and rejuvenated, some of them in repeated revivals.[1] As to the proportion of this total now extant, the student who

[1] Mr. Greg's recent *List of English Plays* "written before 1643 and printed before 1700" includes 764 titles. It obviously includes a number of pre-Elizabethan productions, and, from his plan to include all the works of any author, some of whose plays fall before his upward limit, a number written later.

should be so Quixotic as to plan a personal acquaintance with the entire body of Elizabethan drama must prepare to read at least nine hundred plays, English and Latin, masques, entertainments, and civic pageants included, and account for something less than six hundred and fifty mentions.[1]

Inferences as to distribution.

While it must be remembered that our knowledge in these particulars is defective and must from the nature of the case remain so, one or two inferences which may be drawn concerning the distribution of these productions within the period are not without a certain interest. The middle point numerically falls, curiously enough, just short of the date of Elizabeth's death, so that we may affirm that just about as many plays were staged during the forty-five years of the queen's reign as were performed in the thirty-nine that follow to the closing of the theaters. But if we turn to the two periods of eleven years each (from 1589 to 1600 and from 1601 to 1611) which constitute Shakespeare's active career, we find a preponderance of nearly four to three in favor of the earlier period.[2] Indeed, no decade of the drama can vie with the last of Queen Elizabeth in dramatic as for that matter in other literary activities. Certainly no less than four hundred plays were written and acted within those ten years, an average per year more than double that which appertains to the whole period. But enough of these dry deductions.

Turning to the authors of this old drama, we find

[1] My own figures, on a rough estimate of my material for this book, are 875 plays and masques, to which should be added 33 civic pageants and 640 productions no longer extant.

[2] The figures of my rough list are 377 plays in the earlier period against 279 in the later.

The gentleman author and the playwright.

at the least two hundred names.[1] The activity of this horde of writers varied from the single play of the gentleman amateur who affected a concealment of his authorship, effective only to posterity, to professionals of the surprising activity of Thomas Heywood, who confessed to a share in two hundred and twenty plays, or the more reasonable contribution of Dekker, with whose name no less than seventy-six titles have been associated. The noble and gentleman author is a constant figure of the whole period, from my Lord of Oxenford, Sidney's enemy in the seventies, and Hughes and his fellows, Bacon and others, ten years later, to Carew, King Charles' cupbearer, the Duke of Newcastle, and cavaliers like Lovelace and Habington and triflers like Suckling and Thomas Killigrew. The university man, too, grave, scholarly, and a theorist like Watson, Ascham's friend, remains little changed four generations later in William Strode, canon of Christ Church in the time of King Charles, sage, scholarly, and contemptuous of the drama. In the cut and thrust, likewise, of the personal satire of college drama, the difference between the drastic humor of Nash (had we his *Terminus et non Terminus* to judge by) and Randolph, wit, scholar, and lover of sack that he was, could have been only one in degree, not in kind. It was otherwise with the popular playwright, whether he plied his trade at court or on the boards of the London play-

[1] Fleay, *Stage*, 377, 378, lists some 180 writers, omitting from among them so popular a name as William Hunnis, for example. The list of Latin college plays furnishes several additional names, and there are a few men like Campion, William Browne, and Milton, who wrote masques without writing for either the popular stage or at the universities.

houses; and the contrast lies in the circumstance that he was plying a craft in which adaptability was the first condition of success. Bale, the controversialist; John Heywood, the court jester; Udall, Hunnis, Lyly, the schoolmaster developed into the professional manager and playwright; Sackville, Gascoigne, Daniel, the gentleman of the inns of court perfecting the amateur's adaptation of Latin, Italian, and French examples; Peele, proceeding from the college to the court and from the court to the stage of the city,— such are the well-known steps to Shakespeare and "the actor playwrights."

"The actor playwright."

The term, "actor playwright" has been much extended and misused. As a matter of fact, this title has been denied Marlowe and, of late, Greene also.[1] It is doubtful if Lodge, a lord mayor's son, who tried to conceal his converse with the drama, ever trod the boards; and this doubt applies to Kyd, who revolved in an outer orbit of the Pembroke circle.[2] The class which Shakespeare glorified almost alone took its humble rise in men like Robert Wilson the elder, writer of belated moralities; in Tarlton, the clown; and Anthony Munday, who "was everything by starts and nothing long." Peele seems, after all, to have been the only man of note, Shakespeare's earlier contemporary, who certainly shared with him the double function of actor and playwright. The

[1] The ballad in which Marlowe is described as a player at the Curtain "in his early age" is now considered one of Collier's forgeries. See Sidney Lee in *Dictionary of National Biography*, xxxvi, 181. As to Greene, see Gayley in his *Representative English Comedies*, 402.

[2] See C. M. Ingleby in *Notes and Queries*, sixth series, xi, 107, 415. Mr. Boas' recent work on Kyd contains no suggestion that his author was an actor.

authority which makes Jonson an actor seems not wholly unapocryphal; at the least he could not long have exercised "the quality" successfully with his "mountain belly and his rocky face." [1] In the nineties came Armin, Thomas Heywood, Field, and Samuel Rowley; and William Rowley soon followed. If a group of "actor playwrights" is to be constructed, it must be allowed to extend in point of time from before the Armada well into the reign of King Charles, when Heywood still continued active, and to include as divers names as Shakespeare's, Armin's, and Barkstead's. In short, among two hundred playwrights of the period and two hundred and seventy-five actors, scarcely a score combined the creative function with mimetic art.

Dramatic authorship in the reign of James.

None the less, it is not to be denied that by the date of the accession of King James theatrical authorship had begun to attract the talents of men of better nurture; and Marlowe, the shoemaker's son, Shakespeare, the yeoman's, and Jonson, whose father was apparently a small parson, were followed by Beaumont, son of Judge Beaumont of Grace Dieu, Leicester, Fletcher, younger son of the Bishop of Worcester, and by Chapman, Middleton, and Marston, each of whom might write himself "gentleman" without a present invocation of the Heralds' Office.[2] But men of obscure origin worked and likewise glorified the drama in this and in the next reign, — men like Web-

[1] The only allusion to Jonson as an actor apparently is the charge of Dekker in *Satiromastix*, "I have seene thy shoulders lapt in a plaiers old cast cloake," etc. (*Works of Dekker*, ed. 1873, i, 202), put into the month of Tucca, a notorious liar and boaster. On the subject, see Gifford in Cunningham-Gifford, *Jonson*, i, p. xxxii.

[2] Cf. the efforts of Shakespeare to obtain a grant of arms, Lee, *Shakespeare*, ed. 1898, pp. 188–193.

ster, of whose birth and family we know nothing, Brome who began life as a body servant to Ben Jonson, and Day, briefly described by the same great poet as a rogue.[1] Moreover, Ford, although as loath to steal a book as to purloin its contents, was but a lawyer's factor, and Shirley began a schoolmaster and returned to this hapless vocation and to hack writing in later life.[2]

Personal relations and affiliations of the dramatists.

A rational attempt to group the authors of this long period, and restore to our understanding in any wise their personal relations, must proceed by means of a consideration of the stage history of the time and especially take into account the contemporary practice of collaboration, of which enough has been already said in these pages.[3] Thus Lyly's affiliations were solely with the semi-professional companies of boys at court. With their suppression his career was at an end. Peele transferred his talents from the Chapel Children to the popular stage, writing chiefly after 1594 for the Admiral's men. On the other hand, Greene, like Tarlton who preceeded him, wrote only for the Queen's company of adult actors, the troupe which from 1583 to the formations of its rivals, the Admiral's, Pembroke's, and Lord Strange's companies, in the late eighties, achieved the earliest popular successes on the London boards. Lodge and Marlowe made frequent transfer of their talents from company to company, the latter writing successively for the Admiral's men, the Queen's, Pembroke's, and Lord Strange's. Kyd may perhaps have

[1] *Conversations*, 4.

[2] Day is reported to have been expelled from Cambridge for stealing a book.

[3] Cf. especially, above, i, pp. 265–267.

written for this latter company as for the Earl of Pembroke's.[1] Shakespeare is a notable exception among the poets of the first rank, as he, like Greene before him, wrote for but one company throughout his career. By 1590, despite the able rivalry of the Admiral's and Pembroke's men, the company to which Shakespeare was attached had begun to attract to itself the greater actors and playwrights of the time. Alleyn had acted with that company, then known as Lord Strange's players, in 1593, although he now left them permanently for the Admiral's. Peele and Robert Wilson, most experienced of the older playwrights, came to them in 1590, Burbage joined them from the Queen's players in 1592, Marlowe just before his death in 1593, and Lodge perhaps in 1595. Although these more prominent predecessors of Shakespeare formed in no sense a *coterie*, as has sometimes been stated, there is abundant proof that the university men, Peele, Greene, Lodge, Marlowe, and later Nash, were intimately known to each other. Lyly, from his slightly greater years and from his professional relations to the court, must have stood somewhat apart from these young Bohemians; though, from his share with Nash in the Marprelate controversy, we cannot feel too sure of this.[2] Although we know that he once wrote in the same room with Marlowe, Kyd, too, a scrivener's son and no collegian, was surely looked at askant by Greene, despite his success with his *Spanish Tragedy*, and regarded in the same category with the "upstart crow" who, younger man that he was and likewise of no college, dared successfully rival Robert Greene,

[1] Fleay, ii, 26.

[2] On the subject, see Bond, *Lyly*, i, 51–54.

*Magister utriusque academiae.* Shakespeare must have joined his company before any of these "gentlemen" were attracted to it by his success. After the nineties he could not have remained unknown to them. Save for Greene and perhaps Kyd, there is nothing to gainsay the probability that Shakespeare was on terms of familiar acquaintance with these fellow-workers in his own company and esteemed by them, as he was by Chettle, for his civil demeanor, "his uprightness of dealing," and "facetious grace in writing." [1]

Shakespeare in his professional relations and friendships with Jonson and others.

On the death of Marlowe, Shakespeare succeeded at once to the head of his profession, remaining to the end of the reign practically the only permanent poet of the Chamberlain's company. In extraordinary contrast to this, Henslowe employed during the same period for his Admiral's men at the Rose and at the Fortune no less than five and twenty playwrights; and although Haughton, Rankins, Porter, and Samuel Rowley seem to have written solely for him, the majority transferred their talents at will to the highest bidder, though often willing to return to Henslowe when in straits. Jonson was the first to leave the Admiral's men. This was in consequence of his killing of Gabriel Spenser in 1598. Chapman and Heywood severed their connection in the next year; Middleton, Webster, Drayton, Dekker, and others in 1602; Chettle and Day in 1603. The only other writers for the Chamberlain's men were Armin in 1599, Dekker in *Satiromastix* in 1602, and Drayton, perhaps, intermittently between 1597 and 1605. Jonson returned to Henslowe in 1602 but soon re-

[1] *Kindheart's Dream*, 1592, "To the Gentlemen Readers," *Publications of the Percy Society*, v, p. iv.

joined the company of Shakespeare, for which he wrote, alternating with the Children of the Chapel and their successors, practically to the end of his career.[1] The lasting friendship of Shakespeare and Jonson must have been founded on Shakespeare's recommendation of *Every Man in His Humor* to his company in 1598. That the friendship endured the touch of time and the hand of death, ignorance alone can deny. A tradition repeated by John Ward, Vicar of Stratford, relates that Jonson and Drayton paid a visit to Shakespeare's New Place in 1616, just prior to the owner's death.[2] Drayton may well have been among Shakespeare's friends, and there is nothing improbable in the story, although its consequences to Shakespeare may well have been exaggerated by the ministerial reluctance to spoil a good story for the want of fact. But Shakespeare's closest intimates were indubitably among his fellow actors, Burbage, Heming and Condell, later his executors, and Augustine Phillips. Indeed, if we may judge by the circumstance that the Earl of Southampton, to whom Shakespeare dedicated his narrative poems, is the only patron of Shakespeare that "is known to biographical research," [3] the great dramatist appears to have scorned, or at least neglected, that incessant search for preferment and cultivation of "great ones" that gives to Jonson a list of more than eighty dedicatees and noble patrons.[4] Jonson's friends, too, were legion, as his poems disclose, with upwards of sixty poets, authors, actors, and translators signalized

[1] Cf. Fleay, i, 157–160; and L. Whitaker, *Michael Drayton as a Dramatist.*

[2] See Halliwell-Phillipps *Outlines*, ed. 1898, ii, 70.

[3] Lee, *Shakespeare*, 130.

[4] Fleay, i, 337–340.

in encomium, ode, or epigram.[1] His closest intimates in the drama were Marston, with whom he quarreled, and Chapman, whom he ever esteemed. His similarity in character and ideals must have drawn his fellow scholar very near him. Daniel, Jonson held in contempt, Munday he long ridiculed, Inigo Jones, as we have abundantly seen, was first his associate in the masque and then his bitter enemy. Field he had educated, Randolph and Cartwright in later times were his poetical sons, and Brome had such art in making plays as he possessed, a legacy from Jonson. In short, the associates of Jonson in literature, in the drama, and at court embraced every well-known man in the England of three generations.

Personal relations of Dekker, Heywood, and others.

There is little more than their incessant collaboration to determine the personal relations of men like Dekker and Heywood. The former seems to have been hopelessly improvident, spending years in a debtor's prison. It is difficult to find a playwright in Henslowe's list with whom Dekker was not at one time or another in active collaboration; and for mending, patching, revising, and rewriting he appears to have been the *Johannes Factotum* of his employer. Heywood's life, too, is obscure. He seems, however, to have worked more independently than Dekker, and, like him, for many companies. Both men were of the journalist's type and possessed of the journalist's ease, fluency, and carelessness in writing. It is likely that all of these playwrights of Henslowe led a semi-Bohemian existence, as remote from the easy access to court and to gentle society which men like Jonson, Fletcher, and Beaumont enjoyed as it was removed from the steady industry and substantial

[1] *Ibid.* i, 335–337.

money return of Shakespeare.[1] That these writers, however, were not without an appreciation of their own literary standing and relations, one to the other, is witnessed by more than one of their allusions, though perhaps no one of these is so characteristic as that of Webster's dedication to *The White Devil*, wherein he tells us: "For mine owne part, I have ever truly cherisht my good opinion of other mens worthy labours; especially of that full and haightned stile of Maister Chapman; the labor'd and understanding workes of Maister Johnson; the no lesse worthy composures of the both worthily excellent Maister Beaumont and Maister Fletcher, and lastly (without wrong last to be named) the right happy and copious industry of M. Shake-speare, M. Dekker, and M. Heywood; wishing what I write may be read by their light; protesting that, in the strength of mine own judgement, I know them so worthy, that though I rest silent in my owne worke, yet to most of theirs I dare (without flattery) fix that of Martiall:

*— non norunt haec monumenta mori.*"

Heywood's pleasant jocular couplets, too, on the brotherhood of "our moderne poets," deserve the frequent quotation they receive, even if they shock our preconceptions of the dignity of Parnassus to know that

"Marlo, renown'd for his rare art and wit,
Could ne're attaine beyond the name of Kit;

. . . . . .

Excellent Bewmont, in the formost ranke
Of the rar'st Wits, was never more than Franck.

[1] Dekker shared poetic honors with Jonson in the welcome of the new king to London. He does not appear to have served royalty directly thereafter, though employed, like Heywood and Middleton, as a city poet and maker of civic pageants.

Mellifluous Shakespeare, whose inchanting Quill
Commanded Mirth or Passion, was but Will.
And famous Johnson, though his learned Pen
Be dipt in Castaly, is still but Ben.
Fletcher and Webster, of that learned packe
None of the mean'st, yet neither was but Jacke.
Deckers but Tom; nor May, nor Middleton.
And hee 's now but Jacke Foord, that once were John." [1]

Such passages prove beyond the peradventure of a doubt the easy sociability of the time and the agreeable relations of this small body of talented men pursuing their common vocation in a small capital as yet free from the congestion and overplus of population which paralyze the amenities in modern metropolitan life.

The relations of Beaumont and Fletcher to Shakespeare, Massinger, and others.

Beaumont and Fletcher, after writing variously for the Queen's Revels and the Lady Elizabeth's companies, gravitated by the weight of their talents to the King's men, writing for them their *Philaster* about 1610. Beaumont had written likewise for the King's Revels, but left the stage on his marriage, not long after Shakespeare's retirement, and died a month before Shakespeare. It was doubtless soon after the performance of *Philaster* that Fletcher formed his association with Shakespeare, writing under his supervision, if not with him, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, and revising *Henry VIII* for revival. It does not strike one as irrational to think of Shakespeare, determined to retire, looking about him for a fit successor and selecting this ready and facile young dramatist who had already won his spurs. Leaving this surmise for what it may be worth, certain it is that Fletcher succeeded Shakespeare defi-

[1] *Hierarchie of the Blessed Angels*, 1635, quoted in *Shakespeare's Century of Praise*, 1874, p. 128.

nitely about the date of the latter's death, as chief poet of the King's players, and that he maintained his place as the leading popular dramatist of his day to his own untimely death by the plague in 1625. But Fletcher was far less alone in his premiership than Shakespeare had been in his time. Field became a member of the King's company about 1616, and Massinger, save for a very brief period, was added as a permanent acquisition in the following year. In this year, too, though for the most part engaged with other companies, Webster wrote his great play, *The Duchess of Malfi*, for this leading troupe, and Middleton and William Rowley added their talents in 1623. Thus, during the last two or three years of the reign of King James we find Fletcher, Jonson, Massinger, Middleton, and Rowley all writing for the favorite company. Heywood and Dekker with the Lady Elizabeth's players at the Cockpit were their only rivals of note; but their plays were addressed, taken all in all, to an inferior audience. The names of Beaumont and Fletcher have been linked forever on the title of the folios containing their work; but the personal relations of Massinger with Fletcher could have been no less intimate, if their incessant collaboration signifies anything. Their friendship is attested by more than one allusion all but contemporary, and when Massinger died, in 1639, he was buried in St. Mary Overies, in the grave of Fletcher.[1]

Though writing little for the public theater in the reign of King Charles, and that little ill received by a younger generation that had not known him in his

[1] See, especially, the passages from the *Small Poems* of Cockayne, 1658, quoted by Oliphant in *Englische Studien*, xiv, 55, 56.

prime, Jonson maintained none the less the esteem of the judicious whom he loved, and presided in contentment the sovereign of literary Bohemia. The chief dramatic poet on the accession of Charles was Massinger, who continued in the King's company the traditions and the success of Fletcher. Ford, Davenant, Brome, and many lesser men were Massinger's fellow-dramatists after the death of Fletcher, and he had to withstand a rival, his equal in productivity, inventiveness, and dramatic tact and competency; for James Shirley, writing chiefly for Queen Henrietta's men at the Cockpit, possessed every one of these merits. But in Shirley's case, as in that of so many who had gone before him, the attractions of the King's company prevailed. Before the death of Massinger in 1639, Shirley joined the favorite company and soon succeeded to the post of its chief poet. But the closing of the theaters, two years later, dethroned him, as it displaced lesser men, and the playwright now became a man without a vocation, the actor a pariah in stern Puritan England. The last few years of the drama witnessed an increasing number of gentlemen amateurs writing for the stage as an amusement. Carlell, Habington, Arthur Wilson, Suckling, Killigrew, and Newcastle all contrived in these latter years to have their plays performed by the King's men before royalty. Such a thing would have been impossible in the days of Elizabeth or even of King James. In short, the line between the professional and the amateur dramatist had broken down and Charles himself became the literary adviser of these gentlemen adventurers in the drama and master of his own revels.[1]

Jonson in the reign of Charles; Shirley, last of the great dramatists.

[1] Cf. Herbert's account of the royal definition of "asseverations,"

Lead of Shakespeare's company in the profession; its royal succession of dramatists.

From this epitome of the relations of the chief playwrights to each other and to the companies for which they wrote certain inferences may be drawn. The most striking is the absolute lead which Shakespeare's company maintained from the moment of his first assured success in 1593 to the close of the old drama, a generation after his death. Secondly, we may note the primacy among playwrights of the chief writer for that company in a succession extending from Marlowe, whose death left Shakespeare without a rival, through Fletcher and Massinger to Shirley. It is interesting, too, to note how the careers of these men overlap, Marlowe and Shakespeare appearing as co-workers for the company in 1593, Shakespeare and Fletcher in 1610–1611, Fletcher and Massinger in the latter years of the reign of King James, and Massinger and Shirley in the last two years of the former's life. Indeed, it may be asserted that the rivals of this triumphant troupe, despite the lively competition of Pembroke's men in Elizabeth's reign, the Prince's players in James', and Queen Henrietta's in that of King Charles, were in a sense little more than training-schools for the one truly royal company. Lastly, it is of interest to notice that it was adaptable and mediocre Davenant, not Shirley, last of the great Elizabethan brotherhood, who became the reorganizer of the stage at the resuscitation of the King's company when Charles II assumed his throne. Shirley had joined the King's men too late; Davenant had been eight years his predecessor in writing for them, and had belonged to no other company. Thus this most

and the royal likes and dislikes. Malone, *Shakespeare*, iii, 235, 236, 241.

famous of theatrical companies stretched its lead into a new age; but in breaking with Shirley it broke forever with the great poetical traditions of its past.

Interrelations of the academic and vernacular drama.

From the foregoing chapters it is patent that the English drama in the reign of Queen Elizabeth and in those of her two successors was made up of two strands, the scholarly and academic drama and the plays that flourished in the popular playhouses. While the two types are at all times distinguishable and offer a contrast at once noteworthy and striking, their interrelations, owing to the royal patronage of theatrical entertainments throughout the three reigns, is close, and their influence the one upon the other unintermittent. The ideals of the court involved elegance, display, and costliness; those of the people the wider appeals of terror, humor, and realistic truth. Hence, while the inns of court and the universities pondered on the precedents of the ancients, and writers at court consulted the practices of the contemporary French and Italian stage, the popular theaters were independent of these lets and hindrances, and the vernacular drama developed with a freedom and an unrestraint unparalleled in the history of literature. And yet it was in the schools and the court that the first true drama took its rise, as we have abundantly seen. Every early prominent name in dramatic history is that of a schoolmaster, a courtier, or both; and it is not until the Spanish Armada had come and gone its way to destruction that a vernacular drama worthy to compare with that which was already flourishing at court and in the schools can be said to have come to exist. Lyly was wholly of the academic school, and the only "predecessor of Shakespeare" of whom

this can be said. Daniel was as wholly of it, in later Shakespearean times, and so was Fulke Greville, though Greville's tragedies belong not to the stage. The only other name which deserves to stand beside these is that of Thomas Randolph, who, although assuredly to be classed as one of the "sons of Ben," seems to have lived and written otherwise in peculiar freedom from popular contemporary dramatic influences. To the academic school the drama owes the Senecan craze out of which momentous things, as we have seen, came to pass. To the academic school must be credited, too, the pastoral and the masque, though it is notable that within their stricter limitations these exotics would have remained unfruitful but for the vitalizing influences which the vernacular drama exercised upon them. In the utmost contrast we found the popular and vernacular writers, whose salient traits were the eclecticism of their practice and an unorthodoxy as to "Aristotle's precepts and Euripides' examples" which set the teeth of delicately bred scholarship on edge. But the successes of Greene, Marlowe, Shakespeare, and the rest of the romanticists routed the theorists once and for all; though a new type of author arose in such men as Kyd, Chapman, Jonson, and Marston, whose efforts tended to a judicious tempering of the extravagances of Elizabethan romantic art by an adaptation to English conditions of the rules and precedents of ancient and Italian drama. There is not one of these authors—even Jonson—who is not at times extravagant and bizarre, for all were Elizabethans. But their extravagance is for the most part satirical, and therefore conscious and premeditated; it is the true romanticist alone who is rapt in his own passion and borne away

on the fluttering wings of fancy or into greater heights with the wider sweep of the pinions of poetic imagination. Save for Jonson, Chapman, Marston, and their like, — the dramatists of conscious effort, as we have dubbed them, — the great Elizabethans cared neither jot nor tittle for the theories of Aristotle nor any one else; much less did they concern themselves with the compromise between ancient and modern art or with the counter claims of classic or other ideals. If there be a trait more prominent than any other in a group of writers the multiplicity of whose gifts presages nearly every quality that can grace and distinguish literary art, that trait is their fine spontaneousness and abandon; a spontaneousness that has ever the right word, the natural solution, the rational outcome, an abandon that carries them lightly over difficulties that would wreck self-consciousness and achieves great things apparently as easily as the merest trifles.

London actors in the provinces.

It is a mistake to suppose the drama of the age of Elizabeth and James confined to the precincts of London and the environment of the schools, the universities, and the court, whether in London or on progress. Allusion has been made more than once in these pages to the wanderings of theatrical companies into the English provinces, to Scotland and Ireland, and abroad. Halliwell-Phillipps, who investigated only the visits of Shakespeare's company to the provinces, records fifteen places as visited within the lifetime of Shakespeare, some of them, like Oxford, several times, making a total of twenty-six recorded trips in some twenty years.[1] A more recent investi-

[1] See Halliwell-Phillipps, *Visits of Shakespeare's Company to Provincial Towns*. These records are begun with the year 1597.

gator, whose concern is with the circumstances attending the performances of plays in the provinces between the years 1550 and 1600, and not with the number or localities of these performances, names incidentally more than twenty towns of England and Scotland which were visited — some of them frequently — by traveling troupes within this period.[1] If we add to this the records of certain title-pages, and even the few plays printed in towns other than London, the inference is clear that the range of histrionic entertainment was wide and shared in by towns and villages throughout England, which were thus continuing, and doubtless without interruption, a custom handed down from medieval times.[2] This is not the place in which to go into the details of this subject. Suffice it to say that upon the approval of such credentials as the company may have been able to bear with it, a performance was given before the mayor and his council. For this performance, which was the analogue of a private performance at court, the mayor's gratuity was all that the players could expect; but thereafter they might play publicly and for such charges as they might be able to obtain.[3] It is of

An investigation of the earlier years would materially enlarge the list. Moreover, of some such visits no records may have been kept, and the records of others must certainly have perished.

[1] J. T. Murray, "English Dramatic Companies in the Towns Outside of London," *Modern Philology*, ii, 539.

[2] It is recorded that the wandering troupes again and again acted their secular plays in churches. This was true of Doncaster in 1574, of Plymouth in 1559–60, and its refusal at Leicester as late as 1602 only emphasizes the practice. Cf. *ibid.* 548, citing J. Tomlinson, *Doncaster from the Roman Occupation*, 47; R. M. Worth, *Calendar of the Plymouth Municipal Records*, 117; and W. Kelly, *Notices of Leicester*, 223.

[3] Collier, ii, 274, quoting from Willis, *Mount Tabor*, 1639.

course unquestionable that in many cases but one performance was given, and this must have shared the dual characteristics of a public and a private performance.[1] The place of performance was variously a church, the guildhall, a private house, inn, or inn-yard.[2] It has even been surmised that open-air amphitheaters were so employed and that in other places besides London "regular playhouses" existed.[3] Whilst certain towns of Scotland, like many in England, seem to have early cultivated the art of acting with town "companies," doubtless wholly amateur, the London companies, there as elsewhere, were held in the highest favor and received the most liberal rewards. Of Lawrence Fletcher and his two visits to Scotland enough has been said; and likewise of the part which James Shirley played in carrying over to Dublin the traditions of the Elizabethan stage.[4] Notable, too, are the many visits which troupes of English actors are known to have paid to the continent, to Holland, Denmark, and especially to Germany and even Austria.[5] Nor are the evidences

English actors abroad.

[1] See Murray, 544, and the cases there cited.

[2] As to the use of churches, see above, p. 290 note; at Oxford in 1562, the guildhall was so used (Turner, *Selections from the Records of Oxford*, 299); at Nottingham, the town hall (*Records of Nottingham*, iv, 168); at Leicester, an inn called the Cross Keys (Kelly, *Notices of Leicester*, 224).

[3] On this topic, see Murray, 550; E. Phillips, *History of Shrewsbury*, 201, and cf. Ordish, *Early London Theatres*, 125–141. It is worth noting that the "playhouses" at Exeter as early as 1348, at Great Yarmouth in 1538, and at Worcester in 1584, are none of them playhouses in the sense in which that word is employed of the Globe or of Blackfriars.

[4] Cf. above, i, pp. 493–495; ii, pp. 285, 286. See, also, J. C. Dibden, *Annals of the Edinburgh Stage*, 1888.

[5] On this topic, see, in general, Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*,

of their presence in innumerable towns and cities confined to theatrical lists and town records. Elizabethan drama exerted through these performances abroad a widely extended influence on the German stage, and the repertoire of these itinerant companies has been extended by industrious research so as to include between fifty and sixty plays of English origin, among them some of the more popular works of Greene, Kyd, Marlowe, and Shakespeare, a couple of plays each of Fletcher and Massinger, and single examples of Dekker, Heywood, Chapman, Marston, and Ford.[1] Without here raising a question once much mooted, it is of interest to note a recent reaffirmation of the opinion that the German popular Faust-drama, so rich in example and so national in character, sprung from the introduction of Marlowe's play into Germany by these itinerant troupes rather than from independent adaptations of the *Faust Book* to indigenous dramatic form.[2] Shakespeare, too, however garbled and Germanized, was better known to the *habitué* of the popular German stage of the seventeenth century than to the *literati* of the eighteenth before his German rediscovery about the middle of that century. But if English actors traveled thus widely abroad, English plays went even farther, traversing the wide seas between the decks of English ships. It is startling to hear that at Sierra Leone,

1865; Creizenach, *Schauspiele der englische Komödianten*, 1889; and Herz, *Englische Schauspieler und englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeare's in Deutschland*, 1903.

[1] *Ibid.* especially the second part.

[2] *Ibid.* 74, reaffirming the conclusions of Creizenach, *Versuch einer Geschichte des Volksschauspiels von Dr. Faust*, Halle, 1878; and refuting the opinion of Bielschowsky and Werner, in *Zeitschrift für österreichische Gymnasien*, xliv, 204.

on the coast of Africa, the drama was no unusual accompaniment to the courtesies exchanged by English sea-captains at sea. Under date of September 5, 1607, Captain Keeling, commanding the Dragon, writes: "I sent the interpreter according to his desier abord the Hector whear he brook fast and after came abord mee, wher we gave the tragedie of *Hamlett.*" Later in the month he continues, "Captain Hawkins dined with me, wher my companions acted *Kinge Richard the Second.*" Whilst on the following day he concludes, "I envited Captain Hawkins to a ffishe dinner and had *Hamlet* acted abord mee: which I p'mitt to keepe my people from idlenes and unlawfull games or sleepe." [1]

Roots of Elizabethan drama in its medieval forebears.

Turning for the last time to the classification of the drama by species (one of the chief purposes of this book), a résumé of the ground traversed with a recurrence to its most striking landmarks cannot prove impertinent. It has been the endeavor of this book to show that the roots of Elizabethan drama lie deep in the miracles and especially in the moral plays of medieval times, and that even the extraordinary diversity in kind and in species which the later drama examples is prefigured in them. So far as the miracle play itself was concerned, from its height in the complete cycle of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, it had ebbed through single plays like that of *Mary Magdalene* (*c.* 1485), biblical moralities such as Bale's *Johan Baptistes* (*c.* 1538), and biblical interludes, exemplified in *The History of Jacob and*

[1] *Narratives of Voyages towards the North-west*, edited by Thomas Randall, for the Hakluyt Society, 1849, p. 231, quoting portions of the *Journal of Captain Keeling* not published by Purchas in his *Pilgrims*.

*Esau* (written in Mary's reign), to emerge in regular dramas such as Peele's *David and Bethsabe* (1589).[1] This parent stem of the old sacred drama now ceased to be productive, despite an attempt among the writers for Henslowe to revive the biblical play for the popular stage in 1602 and such late buddings forth in academic form as Sandy's translation of *Christ's Passion* of Grotius (1639), and Milton's immortal *Samson Agonistes*, which lies beyond our period. The miracle play embraced the whole scope of human history as medieval Christianity conceived it; so, too, the morality comprehended a complete range of Christian ethics and an ideal of the conduct of life. The miracle play was tied to the concrete of received fact; the morality might range free among abstractions and find no experience of human life foreign to it as an illustration of its universal theme. It was hence freer and withal nearer to every-day life. And precisely as the miracle had tended to agglomeration until the unwieldy cycle was the result, the morality tended to break up into independent parts and individual scenes from the illustrative and concrete manner in which its abstractions were necessarily represented. The comprehensiveness of the morality is illustrated in such productions as *The Castle of Perseverance* (1471) and in admirable and searching *Everyman*. The ruling interest is here still that of religion. But the sphere of the morality naturally and logically widened under early humanist influence from that of merely religious teaching to embrace the pedagogical morality which

[1] References to the fuller treatment of the topics and plays alluded to in this summary will be best found by the reader by reference to the Index.

exhorted the young to diligence by the praise of learning (*The Four Elements*, 1517), or warned them of the dangers of the broad way in moralities concerning the temptations of youth, typically represented by *Hickscorner* (*c.* 1530). Another extension of the range of the morality was equally logical. Medieval learning was founded on the sanction of authority, its processes were those of dialectics, and the stir in men's religious thoughts that followed the advent of Luther begot a cloud of buzzing and venomous controversialists that darkened counsel as they darkened the sun. The morality, already a recognized popular means of instruction, was converted in the hands of men like John Bale to a weapon of offense and defense when the learned world yielded to that darling sin of the theologian, the refutation of error in others. These three groups of the moralities, the controversial, those in praise of learning, and those on the temptations of youth, continued through plays of lighter interlude type (for example, *New Custom*, an Edward VI play, John Redford's *Wit and Science*, 1540, and *Nice Wanton*, before 1553) into actual drama. Controversial moralities came to an end with triumphant Protestantism enthroned in the person of Queen Elizabeth. The pedagogical moralities emerge into true drama in Gascoigne's *Glass of Government*, 1575, and end there; for the humanists' pedagogics of incessant precept had by this time palled on a much-instructed world, and it began to be suspected by some—a lesson not yet learned by the many — that the drama and the arts might possess some other function than that of deterring the evil-doer and correcting the child. One offshoot of the morality, if not indeed of

the miracle itself, continued alive in the midst of all these dead branches — that is the one derived from the parable of the prodigal son; for the universal contrast involved in this ancient story informs alike such quasi-moralities as *The Disobedient Child* (*c.* 1561) and *Misogonus* (1560–77), and such true comedies as *The London Prodigal* and *Eastward Hoe*, both of the early years of James.

Vital element of medieval drama its contact with life.

Of neither miracle play nor morality can it be truly said that the one was merely a dramatic transcript of scripture or the other a matter wholly of abstractions. Both were the work of men who, whatever at times their learning, were as contemporaneous and absorbed in the manners and usages of their own times as men have always been. The result, as already more than once expressed in these pages, was that whether the theme was bible story, their own English past, the foreign, or the purely imaginary, all was expressed in terms of the familiar present. Thus, the old drama contained ever within it elements which made it, to a greater or less degree, a picture of actual contemporary life. It is, therefore, in the group of moralities in which these elements are strongest, — the group that depicts the social and political life of the times, — that we find the true progenitors of the great English drama to come; for when all has been said concerning classical and foreign influences, these are only the forces that trim and prune; the actual growth of this noble forest of Elizabethan literature has ever been native and indigenous. Of the moralities, then, biblical, pedagogical, polemical, and satirical of society and of state, the last alone proved fertile; and out of the comedy scenes of such productions as Skelton's *Magnificence* (1515) and

Lyndsay's *Satire of the Three Estates* (1540), were begot, with the intervention of John Heywood's farces, late moralities such as *Like Will to Like*, 1561, and those of Wilson the elder, the numerous and extensive progeny of the domestic drama, and the comedy of manners. Heywood's service to the drama was not the invention of the farce-interlude nor yet the introduction of it into England from his French originals. His real service was the recognition of the drama as a means of pure diversion, a thing therefore to be cultivated without ulterior ends and as an art. Even this was no discovery of Heywood's own; for the pageantry and other mimetic entertainments of the court had long accustomed those in high life to the employment of the stage for purposes other than those of instruction and edification. In medieval literature it is always difficult to adjust the counter claims of didacticism and amusement, for the trail of the pedagogue is over it all. That the claims of pure diversion were reckoned with almost from the first and even in the miracle plays themselves, the anathemas of the stricter clergy sufficiently attest. Heywood recognized the giving of pleasure, however, not as one of the essentials of the drama, but as the only essential, and in this his coarse and vigorous interludes became the instrument that set the artistic principle free.

Services of John Heywood to the drama.

From quite another range of medieval ideas the morality came likewise to be affected; and legend, balladry, and story were drawn on to tinge the moral plays of the time with what then received the sanction of history. To the category of legend belong the medieval plays of St. George, of which we find so many traces and possess such uncertain knowledge;

Place of legend, balladry, and story among the forebears of the drama.

to that of balladry the medieval and later dramatizations of tales of Robin Hood; to stories more of actual fact, Bale's *King Johan* and the lost *Burning of John Huss*, both of the days of Henry VIII. Of legendary tales of chivalry more in a moment. The position of *King Johan*, — mere politico-controversial morality though it be, — at the threshold of the stately structure of the chronicle play which the Elizabethans reared to the memory of English kings and historical worthies, is as striking as it is readily recognizable. The steps to the chronicle play lead on through Senecan *Gorboduc* (1562) to *Edward II* (1592) and *Henry V* (1599). Foreign history shows a corresponding evolution, from the lost *Robert of Sicily* (1529), in which the religious element of the sovereign served by an angel could not but have figured, to the interlude of *The Conflict of Conscience* (*c.* 1560), wherein the author, Nathaniel Woodes, "Minister at Norwich," introduced to the stage the career and fate of Francis Spiera, an Italian renegade to Protestantism. This development later evolved true dramas such as Marlowe's *Massacre at Paris* (1593) or Chapman's plays on Byron (1608). Abstraction entered into medieval legend, even into medieval history; balladry was measurably free from it. It may not be too much to affirm that the ballads of Robin Hood, dramatized as we know them to have been at least as early as the days of the Wars of the Roses, performed for the forerunners of the historical drama what Heywood later accomplished, as we have just recorded, for the comedy scenes of the morality of social satire.

It was in the wonder-workings of the saints and the marvelous prowess and strange adventures of

knight errantry that the middle ages found the supply of romantic material which human nature always craves. It is, therefore, with expectation rather than surprise that we note the early advent of the heroical element in the drama, affecting the morality of *The Marriage of Wit and Science* (1569) so as to transmute these two abstractions of the title into a knightly lover, enamored of his fair lady, and begin at court a series of knightly plays. It was through such extravagant productions as *Sir Clyomon* (before 1584), wherein the world as it is conceived in *The Faery Queen* is transferred to the stage, and in *Fair Em* (1589), in which the allegory of contemporary allusion still lingers, that we emerge into the heroical play in more regular dramatic form, such as the anonymous *Charlemagne* (before 1590) and Greene's *Orlando Furioso* (1592).

The heroical element in medieval and later drama.

But the romantic took other forms of manifestation. The court plays of Lyly link as surely with the past as the farcical scenes of John Heywood. The life of Lyly's comedies is their satire; the element in which they exist, allegory. Both of these things are medieval and English. To this they added several traits, derived from the Renaissance spirit of Italy, amongst which their preciosity, their sense of dramatic unity and artistic form, were far from the least. Like Heywood's farces, the comedies of Lyly were written for the narrow confines of a court circle; but their appeal was at the opposite extreme to Heywood's. Lyly sought and reached the culture, the lighter learning, and the sense of the beautiful in his auditors. For the first time, in his comedies, English drama breathes unmistakably the atmosphere of refinement. Lyly raised the drama of the court

Medieval and Renaissance elements in Lyly; his elevation of the drama into an art.

to an art, banished for the time both grossness and amateurishness, and raised the writing of plays to the dignity of a profession.

Classical influence in English comedy.

In our résumé thus far, the transition from medieval drama, with its secondary religious and didactic aims, to modern drama, conceived as an art, has been found to have been brought about by means of John Heywood's recognition of the element of diversion and his consequent erection of the drama into an independent agency, by the secularizing influences of interludes and plays derived from popular story and from the romances of chivalry, and by Lyly's conscious lift of the drama into an art. Classical influence on English drama is directly referable to two sources, the schoolmasters' employment of the acting of Latin comedies as a pedagogical device and the humanists' movement that coincides with the earlier activities of the Reformation. Without here repeating in any detail what it is hoped has already been made sufficiently clear in these pages, it was through such interludes as the English version of Textor's *Thersites* (1537) and the notable comedy of *Roister Doister* (before 1541) that the influence of Plautus extended down to serve as a general model for the intrigues of the comedies of Chapman and for the plots and personages of Jonson. Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors* (1590) was a side issue and an experiment, however acquainted Shakespeare may be shown to have been with the literature of the ancient world.[1] The strength of Plautine influence, despite the two great classicists just

[1] See, on this topic, the scholarly essay of Mr. Churton Collins, "Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar," *Studies in Shakespeare*, 1904.

cited, and a scene or two purloined by Heywood and others, was manifested in the comedies, Latin and English, which continued to flourish at the universities from Gascoigne's *Supposes* (1566) and the celebrated *Pedantius* (1581) to the equally famous *Ignoramus* of King James' time and Cowley's *Naufragium Joculare*, in the latter days of King Charles. Nor need this generalization be in the least damaged by the admission that, whether in the case of Gascoigne, of Chapman, or in that of no small number of the university plays, the influence of the Roman comedian had filtered through Italian intermediaries.

Classical influences in tragedy.

As to the influence of classical tragedy, a Euripidean period has been determined with George Buchanan (*c.* 1540), its chief figure so far as writers of the British islands are concerned. This was followed in the earliest years of Elizabeth's reign by the Senecan craze, exemplified by the translation (we may be sure largely for purposes of acting) of all the tragedies at that time ascribed to the Roman tragedian's pen and by such imitations of his manner through Italian and French intermediaries as Gascoigne's *Jocasta* (1566) and Kyd's *Cornelia* (1592). But Seneca had meanwhile passed beyond translation to affect most powerfully alike the dramas of the court and those of the popular stage. *Gorboduc* (1562) is pure Seneca. *Tancred and Gismunda* (1568) is Seneca applied to the telling of a romantic story of modern passion. The step to *The Spanish Tragedy* (1586) crowned this line of development, and Seneca popularized was the final outcome. Marston in the latter years of the queen was the last great dramatist to recur to this outworn example, although the striking group of plays, known *par excellence* as the

tragedies of revenge, is its indubitable derivative, and Ben Jonson and those who imitated him still later compassed a variety of drama modeled on the classical manner which maintained the best ideals of ancient tragedy. That Senecan influence should continue to animate as it did the endeavors of the academic stage from Daniel's *Cleopatra* and the famed *Roxana* of Dr. Alabaster (both of the early nineties) to Freeman's English *Imperiale* and the Latin *Thibaldus* (both at the end of our period), the conservatism of the academic drama rendered a foregone conclusion.

The variety of Elizabethan drama presaged in the first two decades of the reign.

Within the first twenty years of Elizabeth's reign nearly every variety of drama known to the later decades had been clearly presaged. *The Norwich Pageants* of the temptation of man in Paradise were still flourishing, it is true; and biblical and other moralities such as Wager's *Mary Magdalene*, the anonymous *Liberality and Prodigality*, and Lupton's *All for Money* were on the stage, or at least of sufficient interest to attract the cupidity of publishers. But subjects derived from ancient literature and history — *Meleager*, *Orestes*, *Ajax and Ulysses* — had taken the fancy of the court, together with heroical romances — *Sir Clyomon*, *Common Conditions*, and the Knights, Blue, Red, Irish, Solitary, and other, which figure in the *Revels' Accounts* of the early seventies. Domestic drama, already mature in *Gammer Gurton*, finds its example in the diverting interlude *Tom Tyler;* and the biographical theme, later to prove so rich, is Englished in Woodes' translation of the story of Spiera, mentioned above, and in *Byrsa Basilica* (1570), a fantastic biography of the great contemporary financier, Sir Thomas Gresham.

Moreover, British history was broached, after the example of Bale's *King Johan*, in the anonymous and lost *King of Scots* (1564), and in Legge's *Richardus Tertius* (1579), Latin and Senecan, a poor affair at best, but significant as the earliest extant true drama founded on the annals of an English king. If the "masques of apes, wild men, hunters, and ladies" exhibit as yet little of the grandeur and expense that was to make the masque the wonder of the next generation, the entertainments of royalty and the nobility were already taking on appropriate dramatic form in such work as that of the various poets employed by the Earl of Leicester to entertain her majesty at Kenilworth (in 1576), or the slightly later devices of Munday and Churchyard at Norwich. Sir Philip Sidney, too, in that keen search of his for every classical or foreign form in literature which might beautify the beloved art of poetry in his native tongue, successfully proved in his *Lady of May* such possibilities as the exotic pastoral of Italy might possess; and productions such as the anonymous *Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, if its formlessness and other defects may take it back into the seventies, anticipated, in its romantic tale, its mythological personages, and the low comedy carried on by the servants, the combination out of which Peele and Lyly wrought the artistic court drama of the next decade. The earlier years of Elizabeth's reign witnessed the vogue of Seneca, the performance of *Gorboduc*, and what followed; but they witnessed, likewise, *Tancred and Gismunda* (1568) and Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra* (1578), in both of which, despite many shortcomings, appear for the first time drafts on that fertile quarry of the later

Elizabethans, the romantic and amorous tales of the Italian *novellieri*.

The period of Lyly, 1579–88.

The third decade of Elizabeth's reign is, for the drama, the period of Lyly, with whom there was no one to vie in repute, unless it may have been Dr. Gager, whose Latin tragedies and comedies—*Ulysses Redux*, *Meleager*, *Dido*, and *Rivales*—enjoyed a great repute at Oxford. Even greater was the success of *Pedantius*, now definitely ascribed to 1581, at the sister university. As to the popular stage, it was still groping, up to 1585, in the semi-moralities of Robert Wilson, with his abstract *Lords and Ladies of London*, or in medley plays such as Tarlton's *Seven Deadly Sins* must assuredly have been. But the title *Murderous Michael* suggests the coming bourgeois murder play, soon to reach its height in *Arden of Feversham*. *The Blacksmith's Daughter*, "containing the Treachery of the Turks," suggests the breezy drama of adventure soon to rise into popularity; and *The Famous Victories of Henry V*—not impossibly also Tarlton's—the inspiriting scenes of the national historical drama. Of Lyly and his success no more need be said. His only rival at court was George Peele, who had come from the tutelage of Gager and soon passed to the companionship of Wilson, for whose company, the Queen's (about 1586), it seems reasonable to believe that Peele wrote *The Lamentable Tragedy of Locrine*.[1] *Locrine* is Seneca popularized with such a vengeance that we cannot but suspect so notorious a wit as honest George of an intent in it to parody the Senecan craze as he later parodied

[1] *Locrine* was printed by Thomas Creede, who printed other plays certainly of the Queen's men. See Fleay, ii, 320.

the extravagances of heroical romance in *The Old Wives' Tale*.

The first great tragedies.

Much doubt and difference of opinion still attaches to the precise dates of the three important dramas, *The Spanish Tragedy*, *Tamburlaine*, and *Arden of Feversham*, and the decision of their various claims to priority, one over the other, need not concern us here or elsewhere. Whether *Arden* dates so late as 1592, as most recently argued, in no wise affects the character of the group of murder plays of which it is the most conspicuous example. That *Tamburlaine* and *The Spanish Tragedy* were on the stage before the coming of the Armada seems now generally accepted, and no discovered priority of other plays of like kind can disturb the preëminent historical position which these two remarkable tragedies hold at the threshold of serious romantic drama. To contrast them here once more or add further word about their famous authors would be impertinent in a summary such as this. Suffice it to recall that the services of Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* and the best of his other work consist to a large degree in his inventive example, in the device of effective situations, and in his power to vitalize the personages of the stage; while Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*, with the great works that followed close upon it from his pen, gave to English literature for the first time a truly heroic conception of human passion in dilation under stress of inordinate desires and extraordinary afflictions.

The period of Marlowe, 1588–93.

In the six or seven years that lay between Marlowe's *Tamburlaine* and his untimely death, the extraordinary variety of Elizabethan drama first exhibits itself to the full. The popularity of roman-

tic tragedy and of chronicle history was all but simultaneous. The height of the domestic drama, of romantic comedy, and the comedy of manners came later. The heroical romance continued from Greene's *Orlando* to its bourgeois degradation in Heywood's absurd *Four Prentices of London* (1594); the Tamburlaine or conqueror plays, in *Cyrus*, *Alphonsus*, *Selimus*, and the lost *Scanderbeg*, maintained a steady popularity all but equaled by the series on palace intrigue and revenge represented in the plays on Titus, *The Lascivious Queen*, and the early lost *Hamlet*. And all of these classes vied with the growing vogue of dramatized history of England which from mere interludes, like *Jack Straw*, and panoramic trilogies, like *Henry VI*, was raised through an unexampled variety to Marlowe's consummate tragedy of *Edward II* (1592) and the epic-dramatic completeness of Shakespeare's *Henry IV* and *Henry V* (1598–99). But these were not only the days of Shakespeare's dramatic rivalry of Marlowe in the chronicle plays; Greene, too, with his great but lesser talents, dared to measure swords with the author of *Tamburlaine*, not only in the conqueror play (with *Alphonsus* and perhaps *Selimus*), but in matching the harmless white magic of his *Friar Bacon* with the sinister black magic of *Faustus*. In this transmutation of a tragic theme to one of comedy, careless and dissolute Greene displayed the strength of his dramatic talent, which was less that of the large-toned utterance of the conquerors' bombast or the romantic extravagance of Orlando run mad than the representation of simple English rural life in comedy (as in *Friar Bacon* and *The Pinner of Wakefield*), or in situations no more serious than the

pathetic loves and cross purposes of *The Scottish History of James IV*. Despite a very few noteworthy exceptions and the fact that the earliest comedies of Shakespeare certainly fall before 1593, this period was not one in which romantic comedy can be said to have flourished. Such comedies as Peele's *Old Wives' Tale* and dainty *Mucedorus*, which we would fain believe the work of Thomas Lodge, may both be regarded as in a sense the outcome of the heroical romances, the former ironic, the latter naïve. As to Shakespeare, he was clearly as yet in his apprenticeship and imitative period, experimenting with Plautine intrigue in *The Comedy of Errors* and with Lyly's court comedy of satiric allusion in *Love's Labour's Lost*. These years, which are *par excellence* the years of Marlowe, were the times of serious romantic drama and of epic, historical, and tragic preferences; and it is interesting to notice how out of them arose the long series of popular dramas founded on classical and modern foreign history, beginning with such productions as Lodge's *Wounds of the Civil Wars of Marius and Sulla* (before 1590), and Nash and Marlowe's *Dido* (not much later), with the latter's *Massacre at Paris* (1593), and leading on, the latter to Chapman's *Bussy D'Ambois* (1601) and his other French "histories," the former to *Julius Cæsar* (of the same year) and the later achievements in drama on classical themes of Shakespeare and Jonson.

Shakespeare at his height, 1593–1602; his preëminence in chronicle history and romantic comedy.

From the death of Marlowe to the accession of King James, or, in parlance better suited to our subject, from *Richard III* (1593) to *Hamlet* (1602), we have the years *par excellence* Shakespearean. This was the hey-day of the chronicle history, which continued in ever-increasing vigor to the close of

Elizabeth's reign, and in what may be termed the obituary plays, a year or two beyond.[1] To this, the most distinctively English group of the entire drama, Marlowe had contributed the concentrated passion and pathetic end of his King Edward, Heywood the touching domestic story of Jane Shore, and now Shakespeare, in the stories of a dozen kings, breathed immortality into the old tales of Holinshed and embalmed the memory of English sovereigns in the pomp and splendor of imperishable art. This was likewise the flourishing period of the domestic drama and of the romantic comedy of Shakespeare as well. The actual is the theme of the former,—the actual in its mediocrity, as in the gruesome line of murder plays; the actual illuminated by a turn of the romantic as in Dekker's *Shoemakers' Holiday* (1599), or seasoned with hearty humor as in this same comedy, and in Porter's *Two Angry Women* (1598) or *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* (1600). Save for *The Merry Wives of Windsor* (1598), we find Shakespeare not in domestic drama of native English scene. But when we consider, as we have so often been reminded, how superficial at best was the outlandish and romantic setting of the average Elizabethan play, the story of Kate the Curst and her subjection to man, of Helena's winning of a reluctant husband, of Isabella's devotion to an unworthy brother, the loves of Romeo and Juliet, and the tale of Othello, wrought and practiced on to jealous madness,—all are of the very essence of domestic drama. As to romantic comedy, nowhere is the supereminence of Shakespeare more striking; for while the lighter productions of these years teem with romantic situations,

[1] Cf. below, p. 412.

such as the love stories contained in plays like the older *King Leir*, *Old Fortunatus*, or Jonson's *Case is Altered*, this element is usually combined with others, as in these cases with a chronicle play, a tale of folk-lore, or a comedy of Plautine situation. It was left to Shakespeare, for the time almost alone, to pen, in *The Merchant of Venice*, in *Much Ado*, and in *Twelfth Night*, those lightsome and charming pictures of the courtship and the heart's sorrows of young lovers, thrown into the enchanted land of Italy to veil but not conceal their true English natures, and thus add the zest of novelty to their delightful adventures. This is not all that the romantic comedies of the master contain, whose view of life was ever so steady and so whole that he, least of all authors, ever withdrew its elements into a biased draught of the half truth. But the quality of romantic beauty (whatever else is in them) is the distinguishing quality of all of these comedies, as it remained the salient feature of the more serious comedies — *All's Well* and *Measure for Measure* — that followed them in the last years of the old queen's reign.

Jonson's satire and comedy of humors; Marston's revival of the tragedy of revenge.

As we approach these years there are other things to chronicle. First, an over-ingenuity in the comedy — it might almost be called the farce — of disguise and mystification in plays such as Munday's *John a Kent* and *Look About You*, both slenderly connected with the chronicle play and belonging to the middle nineties. This led on to the preposterous entanglements of such plots as Chapman's early comedy, *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* (1596). There was also Heywood's attempt to popularize dramatized ancient mythology in his five ingenious plays on the golden and the other four ages of much the same

date; and Shakespeare's successful solution of the representation of classical history on the popular stage in *Julius Cæsar* (1601). This success elicited, two years after, a rejoinder from Jonson, who held up his classical ideals in *Sejanus*, a replication of protest against Jonson's pedantry from Marston in his *Sophonisba*, and an humble imitation from Heywood in his *Rape of Lucrece* (all three of the year 1603). No less important was Chapman's recurrence, in *All Fools* (1599), and in *May Day* (1601), to Plautine intrigue; and Jonson's epoch-making *Every Man in His Humor* (1598), with his revival in *Every Man out of His Humor*, *Cynthia's Revels*, and *Poetaster* (1599–1601), the great dramatic satires of the war of the theaters, of the old comedy of satirical allusion with an arrogant self-righteousness and an inordinate power unequaled in the history of literature save for the comedies of Aristophanes. In this stage quarrel, as elsewhere, Daniel was Jonson's butt; Marston was his antagonist if not the provocative cause of the whole affair; and Dekker, in his *Satiromastix* (1602), a paid mercenary, against Jonson. There was more noise and fence about it all than actual combat, and the notion that Shakespeare was in any wise seriously involved may be dismissed as one of the vagaries of ingenious criticism. The universities, too, seem to have shared in this revival of dramatic satire, for to this period belong the clever Parnassus plays at Cambridge with their interesting commentary on the popular stage of the moment. Lastly, these latest years of Queen Elizabeth witnessed Marston's deliberate revival, in the second part of *Antonio and Mellida* (1599), of the old tragedy of revenge with Jonson's consequent revisions of *The*

*Spanish Tragedy*, Shakespeare's rival rewriting of the old *Hamlet* of Kyd, and the lesser following of Chettle's *Hoffman*.

Contribution of the court to the drama in the first years of James; the masque and the pastoral.

With the coming to England of the Scottish king and the social activity of a new court, a new impetus and new directions were imparted to the drama. The court and the gentlemen of the inns of court had produced nothing distinctive since the earlier successes of Lyly, save the premonitory masque of Campion and Davison in the *Gesta Grayorum* of 1594. Both were wedded to trumpery mumming and to Seneca in the modified French form which the Earl of Stirling was still practicing in *Monarchic Tragedies* after the earlier models of Daniel's *Cleopatra* (1594) and *Philotas* (1604). Jonson (and Daniel in a very minor part) now developed the masque to its artistic if not to its sumptuary height; and, with the aid of Inigo Jones, the royal architect, introduced movable scenery, effects of change, color, and light as the customary accompaniments of theatrical performances at court. Even if unquestionable evidence did not exist to disprove so incredible an hypothesis, it would be impossible to believe that the popular stage, with its patronage by the royal family and its constant relations with the court, should have remained for a generation or more wholly unaffected by these striking innovations in dramatic technique.[1] Unquestionably the staging of plays on the London boards was profoundly affected and modified by the new devices at court. A second addition of the court poets of the early days of James to the teeming dramatic categories of the time was the pastoral drama; and here Daniel stands, despite the

[1] Cf. Lee, *Shakespeare*, 39.

pastoral tone of certain of Peele's, Lyly's, and Shakespeare's earlier comedies,[1] the indubitable corypheus of a new departure with his *Queen's Arcadia* (of 1605), and slighter *Hymen's Triumph* (nine years later). Despite the attempt and failure of John Fletcher in his *Faithful Shepherdess* (1608) to transfer this exotic of distant lands to the popular stage, and despite many other interesting and poetic examples of its kind in the reign of James and his successor, the pastoral never obtained a footing among indigenous English dramatic modes. Fletcher's poetical comedy, with the fragment of Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, which, notwithstanding recent ratiocination, one would fain connect with the momentary vogue about 1614 of its kind, are the two best pastoral dramas in the language.[2] Of the rest no further word is necessary here.

The popular drama in the first years of King James; height of romantic tragedy.

On the popular boards the succession of species in the earlier years of King James is more continuous of the past. The chronicle history, except for such obituary plays as Heywood's *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody* (1604), ceases to hold the stage, although there were revivals, such as that of *King Henry VIII* (in 1613). The murder play, too, loses its impulse with *The Yorkshire Tragedy* (1605). But the domestic drama of less tragic type, romantic tragedy in variety greater than ever, history more particularly classical and foreign, and comedy romantic, realistic, and satirical, all held the stage in simultaneous profusion. It was just about the time of the new king's accession that the domestic drama gave to the stage the powerful and pathetic scenes

[1] Cf. *The Arraignment of Paris, Love's Metamorphosis, Gallathea,* and *As You Like It.*

[2] Cf. above, pp. 166–168.

of Heywood's *Woman Killed with Kindness;* and that profound and artistic treatment of the world theme, woman's undying conflict with man, *The Honest Whore* (by Dekker and Middleton), followed in the first year of the reign. Into this period continued, too, from the last those dramas of the unconscionably patient wife as exampled in Heywood's fine comedy, *The Wise Woman of Hogsdon* (possibly 1604); and *The Taming of the Shrew*, of earlier date, was revived for the production of Fletcher's entertaining sequel, *The Tamer Tamed* (perhaps as early as 1606). The most striking group of plays which received their impetus in the last years of Elizabeth was, as we have seen in a paragraph above, the tragedy of revenge. To Marston's *Antonio's Revenge*, *Hamlet*, and *Hoffman* therein mentioned, must be added in the new reign Tourneur's powerful *Atheist's Tragedy*, a patent effort to outdo the horrors of *Hoffman*, and a far abler play. Chapman's *Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois* courts a closer comparison with *Hamlet* in its "Senecal" hero, Cleremont, and *The Revenger's Tragedy*, also attributed to Tourneur, reaches the *ne plus ultra* of its kind in originality of situation and consummate employment of dramatic irony by means of which it depicts the utterly wicked and depraved life of one of the hideously corrupt courts of the Italian decadence. But romantic tragedy in this the greatest period of Elizabethan drama reached heights, save for *Hamlet*, beyond the series of revenge. For these were the days of *Othello*, *Lear*, *Macbeth*, and *Antony and Cleopatra*, all huddled (marvelous to recall) into four successive years; as these were, too, the years of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Maid's Tragedy*, of Marston's *Insatiate*

*Countess*, Middleton's *Women Beware Women*, and Webster's *White Devil*, even if recent research must date beyond it, as late as 1617, this great poet's companion masterpiece, *The Duchess of Malfi*.[1] The line of great dramas on classical story inaugurated in *Julius Cæsar*, and followed in *Sejanus* and *Sophonisba*, received further addition, a few years later, not only from Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Coriolanus*, and *Timon* (not to mention *Pericles* and *Cymbeline*, which belong in different categories), but likewise from Jonson's *Catiline*, in which once more Jonson proved, if not to the world, at least to "the judicious," how a classical drama might be constructed with a full regard for the conditions of the contemporary English stage. Chapman's plays on modern French historical subjects, which are less dramas of the chronicle type than studies in dramatic portraiture, continued throughout this period. A new feature in them, especially in *The Conspiracy* and *The Tragedy of Byron* (1608), was their none too covert allusions to contemporary politics and scandal in the French court, a feature that elicited a complaint from the ambassador of that nation, threatened the author with imprisonment, and mutilated his text.

The flourishing of romantic comedy and the earlier comedy of manners.

The years between the accession of King James and the retirement of Shakespeare likewise mark the height of English comedy. Though Shakespeare himself after *Measure for Measure* (*c.* 1604) turned to tragedy and "romance," the effect of his ideal treatment of romantic character in comedy was by no means lost on his greater contemporaries. Echoes of lighter Shakespearean romantic art can be heard in

[1] Above, i, pp. 589–592.

joyous comedies such as Day's *Isle of Gulls* (1605) and *Humor out of Breath* (1608), although the first at least retains much of the flavor of Lyly. In Chapman's admirable *Gentleman Usher* and *Monsieur D'Olive*, too, Shakespearean reminiscences recur; and even in Marston and in early work of Middleton, although the satirical and realistic genius of both of these turned them more to the comedy of manners. Above all do Beaumont and Fletcher disclose their romantic paternity in word and phrase. Jonson turned now from his futile warfare with the gulls and poetasters to the masque at court and to the composition of his learned Roman tragedies, as we have just seen; but he also found time to continue the practice of his comedies of humors, now tempered by his acceptance of English scene, his recognition of the superior claims of truth to personal satire, and converted into the most consummate comedies of manners in the range of the literature, *Eastward Hoe*, *The Alchemist*, *The Silent Woman*, *Bartholomew Fair:* in *Volpone* alone (which preceded all of them save perhaps the first) did Jonson revert to foreign scene and to the satirist's whip of scorpions to produce a cool and consummate study in human depravity, unsurpassed in all the heated dramatic paroxysms of the romanticists. The Jonsonian comedy of manners, despite its English dress and its tempered satire (if contrasted with his true comedies of humors, both earlier and later), never lost its self-consciousness and its remembrance of Roman comedy. The comedy of manners of Middleton, on the other hand, was free from both of these restrictions and content to produce a picture, too often grossly faithful, of the lives and the doings

of the lower middle classes of London. The Middletonian comedies of London life from *Michaelmas Term* (1604) to *No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's* (in 1613) are of an extraordinary excellence in their kind and led to a host of rivals and imitators, — greatest among the first, Fletcher in this time, — and to a school of comedy writing, however stiffened at times by the more stringent and difficult practice of Jonson, that extended down to Etheridge, Vanbrugh, and the later days of Sheridan.

Shakespearean "romance" and Fletcherian tragicomedy.

But perhaps the most important change in the drama of these years was that which brought into vogue the new dramatic species known as "romance" and tragicomedy. Definition and distinction is unnecessary here. Suffice it to recall that this species of drama demands the excitation of the more serious emotions with a ban upon the tragic outcome; its cry is for novelty, surprise, and variety, and for a sumptuousness in costume and setting which it derived from the vogue of the masque. The sudden uprise of this kind of drama when James had been on his throne some half dozen years has been referred to various causes, among them the changing taste of the age, the logical development of Shakespeare's art, and the deliberate and conscious invention of Fletcher. This last may be denied, at least so far as its corollary, which declares that a momentous change in Shakespeare's practice of his art in the strength of his maturity — the change from *Twelfth Night* and *Macbeth* to *Pericles*, *The Winter's Tale*, and *Tempest* — is referable to the direct example of Fletcher, a beginner in the drama at this time and a man fifteen years Shakespeare's junior.[1] That Shakespeare,

[1] Thorndike, 5–7, 149–150.

when it was his to do as he would, should have found a solace after the storm of his tragic period in stories of the melancholy wanderings of Pericles, the wifely devotion and constancy of Imogen and Hermione, and the sweet young maidenhood of Perdita and Marina, is as reasonable as that he should have humored audiences, satiated with terror and wearied with incessant reflections of themselves in comedies, realistic and satirical. The reader must be referred for these matters elsewhere.[1] But certain, it seems to the present writer, are the manifold unlikenesses of the "romances" of Shakespeare with their wanderings over strange seas and into strange lands, their shipwrecks and other adventures, and their imaginative flights into regions supernatural, to anything in Fletcherian tragicomedy, the life of which is indoors, or at least within the precincts of the court, its themes the intrigues of love, ambition, and revenge, its tendency to typical characters, and its contrasts of sentimental feeling with tragic passion and situation. Beaumont and Fletcher's *Philaster* (1609) must ever be chronicled an epoch-making play; for, with its close successor, *King and No King*, it marks a new departure in combining with elements heroically tragic a comedy of sentimental interest, and effecting by a method, confessedly that of contrast and surprise, a result alike vivid, novel, poetical, and effective. This method Fletcher extended to tragedy, to the pastoral, and later to ancient British and to classical history, accomplishing therewith such notable dramatic successes as *The Faithful Shepherdess* (1609), *The Maid's Tragedy* (1611), and the later histories of *Bonduca* and *Valentian*. The new Fletcherian

[1] Cf. above, pp. 197–204.

technique was like a music less sweet and full of hidden beauties but more intricate and brilliant; like a painting less harmonized in color than vivid in tone, keyed daringly high, and effective for its daring. Yet notwithstanding the striking character of Fletcherian tragicomedy and Middletonian comedy of manners, equally successful in its kind, and notwithstanding that Shakespeare was now in the maturity of his splendid tragedy, followed by his gracious and beautiful last plays, this period of the first decade of King James is perhaps best denominated the period of Jonson for the revolution which his masques effected in the entertainment of the court, for the professional technique which his enlightened classicism imparted to the drama at large, the literary success of his Roman plays, and the literary and popular triumph of his unmatchable comedies of manners. Shakespeare is ever in the more restrictive sense of the word Elizabethan; Jonson was Jacobean, and for that reason the dominating dramatic influence of the earlier half of the reign of King James.

The period of Jonson, 1603–12.

The year 1616 witnessed the death of Shakespeare and Beaumont, both retired from dramatic activity some five years before. Old Henslowe, acquisitive and aggressive to the end, likewise died in this same year, and Burbage followed three years later. The old *régime* was passing rapidly away. Jonson, too, had turned from the stage to the more lucrative vocation of maker of masques to the court; and these by-products of the drama continued in his hands, and in those of Chapman, Campion, Browne, and others, of increasing complexity, splendor, and costliness. A feature of this time was the allusiveness of the historical drama to affairs abroad and even at home.

Dramas of contemporary historical allusion.

*The Noble Spanish Soldier* (of doubtful date) and *Thierry and Theodoret* (1617) tell tales of scandal in the French court, the first in terms of a story of Spain, the second in the disguise of an old French chronicle. *Barnavelt* (1620) dramatized events in Holland before they had crystallized from the fluidity of news to the fixity of history; and Middleton's *Game at Chess* (1624) struck nearer home and dared allegorically to represent the course of contemporary English politics with reference to the negotiations for the Spanish marriage, placing not only unmistakable caricatures of nobles and bishops of both nations on the stage as pieces in the game, but actually figuring forth their majesties of Spain and of England in a manner sufficiently unmistakable to rouse the ire of the Spanish minister and move the royal council to action against the bold players.[1] No wonder that flight alone prevented trouble for the satirical dramatist in more than one such case, and that several plays of the kind have come down to us in mutilated form (as have Chapman's dramas on the Duke de Biron), or, escaping both print and the censor, have either perished or remained to be discovered, as was *Barnavelt*, in our own day.

The period of Fletcher, 1612–25.

Aside from a few tragedies and historical dramas, — among them *The Changeling*, *The Duchess of Malfi*, and the *Nero* of 1624, — the comedy of manners and tragicomedy divided the honors of the time; although some noble plays of the domestic type, such as *A Fair Quarrel* (1617) by Middleton and Rowley, *The Fatal Dowry* (1619) by Massinger and Field, and *The Witch of Edmonton* (1621) by Dekker, adorn dramatic annals. When all has been said, however,

[1] On the subject, see Bullen, *Middleton*, i, pp. lxxviii–lxxxvi.

the latter half of the reign of King James is the period of Fletcher, who stood in serious drama the foremost, even if he was followed in both by his collaborator Massinger, rivaled in the comedy of manners by Middleton, and surpassed in the one supreme tragic effort of Webster, *The Duchess of Malfi* (1617). Of the adaptability and careless ease of Fletcher's dramatic art enough has been said. That he borrowed readily and appropriated what he borrowed with skill is not to be denied. Fletcher utilized the old sources for plot and character, and opened a new source in his employment of Spanish story, derived, we may feel reasonably sure, in every case through the medium of a language with which he was more familiar than with that of Castile. But, withal, the inventiveness of Fletcher is not for a moment to be gainsaid; and it is almost as easy to find reasons for praising his resourcefulness in plot and the variety which his personages offer to the appreciative reader as it is to fall into the usual paroxysms over his degeneracy into types of character and situation. Fletcher and his followers had alike the advantage and the disadvantage of a great drama before them. The examples of their predecessors were fruitful in warnings and sign-posts to success. Fletcher and Massinger, and Shirley after them, were practical playwrights, not theorists like Jonson. They put ideals aside and were content to please their audiences by a careful attention to the contemporary taste. In this they differed at once from Shakespeare, who was able to guide his public and raise it to an appreciation of his own lofty standards, and from Jonson, who fought hopelessly and without conciliation against the degenerating moral and artistic taste of his time. In

Fletcher and Massinger the romantic spirit of Shakespeare's later plays became the predominating influence, and what in Shakespeare was but one of many modes of dramatic utterance becomes in them all but the only note. Even the comedy of manners, barring some exceptions, assumes in the hands of these even-paced writers a quasi-romantic mien, and they are as far as possible from the vigorous Jonsonian accent of personal satire. On the whole, the dramatic capability exhibited in the group of plays known as Beaumont and Fletcher's has never been surpassed. Jonson is more ingenious and learned in plot; in pathos and poetry Beaumont and Fletcher have been equaled, in humor and characterization surpassed. But English literature knows no other such complete dramatists. Even Shakespeare, because he is so much more, is less typically the master of dramatic art.

Degeneracy of late Jacobean and Carolan drama in moral tone.

Fletcher has commonly been arraigned as the corrupter of the stage, the author to whom is due, more than to any other, that degeneracy in ethical tone which is apparent in the most casual comparison of the theater of Marlowe and Shakespeare with that of Davenant and Dryden. This is only partly true: for this old drama, written wholly by men for performance by men before an audience in which no reputable woman appeared unmasked, is broad of speech throughout, and capable of frankly representing situations which would be impossible (save by innuendo) on the modern stage. As to mere openness of speech, Fletcher is less coarse than Shakespeare, far less so than Jonson. But this decline in ethics is no mere matter of language; it lies deeper and is subtler far. It enters into the fiber of the story

and into the very heart of the characters to unknit those sinews of moral law which alone can sustain the flesh that moulds the form of artistic beauty. The purity of the love of Romeo and Juliet and the naturalness and truth of the theme and the telling of it have already called for our comment. In Beaumont and Fletcher's tragicomedy, *King and No King*, the plot turns, as we have seen, on the passion of Arbaces, king of Iberia, for Panthea, his reputed sister; and the reader is lured by this heightened situation to a climax in which the threatened enormity of the lovers' union is resolved into comedy by the discovery that the report of their consanguinity is false. In the revolting underplot to Middleton's *Women Beware Women* incest is frankly the theme; it is the lovers who are deceived, and tragedy is the inevitable outcome. Finally, in Ford's subtle and dangerous tragedy, *'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, the criminal passion of a brother and sister is turned into a problem, and we are harrowed with pity where pity belongs not, and asked to admit an exception to an ethical generalization of universal acceptance. Here in brief are exemplified the steps in the moral decline of tragedy, steps by no means illustrative of the whole drama, but steps in which Fletcher, like Middleton and others, fell in, all too readily, with the social trend of his time. Fletcherian drama exhibits a narrowing of the dramatic range, a flaw in the ethical logic of tragedy, a fault in the more trivial relations of comedy, and flippancy only too often with respect to conduct which serious-minded men regard seriously. For all this several reasons may be assigned. Most important among them is the loss of a national spirit due to the occupancy of the throne by

a foreigner, for in those days King James was no less; the narrowing constituency of the stage referable to the spread of the Puritan spirit; the recent formation and growth of a metropolitan society; and, lastly, the tendency towards conventionality, characteristic of the later products of all literary schools. Into these matters there is no need here repetitiously to enter. Suffice it to recognize in Fletcher the lens which, breaking up the clear white light of Shakespeare's dramatic art, allowed only the vivid rays of tragicomedy and the diminished lights of romantic sentiment and conventional comedy of manners to pass through to a later age.

Fletcher the pervading influence of serious drama in the earlier years of King Charles.

The death of Fletcher in the year of the accession of King Charles could little have affected the stage, so strong was the hold of Fletcher's own plays upon it, so confirmed had become the Fletcherian manner in all its species, and so well were the young Fletcherians drilled in his familiar personages and situations, even in his tricks of speech and tripping hendecasyllabic line. Grant to Massinger a modicum of independence in these matters, a certain moral earnestness, and a variety in theme; grant him, moreover, in his two famous comedies, *The City Madam* (1619) and *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* (1625), an enlightened following of both Middleton's realistic play of contemporary life and of the more consummate constructiveness of Jonson's comedy of humors, and yet this famous collaborator of Fletcher none the less swung powerfully within the latter's orbit and prolonged the practices and triumphs of Fletcherian art in many a fine drama of his sole writing. *The Great Duke of Florence*, *The Roman Actor*, *The Picture*, *The Renegado*, *Believe as You*

*List*, it matters not whether the scene is Italy, ancient Rome or Carthage, modern Hungary or Tunis, all is informed with the same light, romantic spirit, accomplished with the same careless ease, effect, and inventiveness that belong to Fletcher himself. The most remarkable thing about Massinger's tragicomedy is the circumstance that any author could be at once so frankly imitative in the larger sense and yet escape, as Massinger indubitably does escape, the charge of mere borrowing and literary theft. But this delicate art of follow my leader in gait and mien became, with greater or less problematic success, the abiding characteristic of Carolan tragicomedy and lighter drama at large; for by the thirties the pinnaces of Shakespeare's earlier art, and even the larger hulks of the great comedies of Jonson, stood well down on the horizon, and save for Shirley, of whom more in a moment, and some minor craft that refused to fly the sovereign flag, it was Fletcher everywhere. If exceptions to this prevalent mode are to be recorded, Davenport's *King John and Matilda* (1625–1636) is an honest and able endeavor to revive an interest in the forgotten plays of chronicle type, and the underplot of the anonymous *Dick of Devonshire* (1625) thrills, for the nonce, with a fine old-fashioned insularity. We might add to these Ford's historical tragedy of *Perkin Warbeck* (1633), were it not for a suspicion that the theme was chosen by the master of "the problem drama" of his day less for its English scene than, like Massinger's *Believe as You List*, for its historical problem. Davenant's revival of the pseudo-historical tragedy of blood is even less certainly in contrast with the prevailing mode; for his *Albovine* and his *Cruel Brother*

(1626 and 1627), with Fletcher's *Thierry* and *The Bloody Brother* in mind, show a paternity in more than the accident of the recourse of the one to old chronicles and the title of the other. It was in the early years of King Charles that Randolph wrote his *Amyntas*, the most successful pastoral drama in the language, if we except a single play of Fletcher and a fragment of Jonson. It was perhaps as late as these years that William Rowley achieved his terrible masterpiece, *All's Lost by Lust* (printed in 1633), and Heywood contributed his pleasing later comedies, *The English Traveller* and *A Challenge for Beauty;* though the last seems to reflect, like his revived *Loyal Subject*, the Fletcherian tragicomedies of a contest for honors such as *The Knight of Malta*, *The Laws of Candy*, and *Royal King and Loyal Subject.* Further, in these years of King Charles, Thomas May attempted a revival of Jonsonian Roman tragedy, while his old master returned to the satire, allegory, and "humors" of all but his earliest efforts for the stage. But even the classical tragedies of May are touched with the romanticism of Fletcher, whose influence, do what they might in serious drama, his immediate successors seem not to have been able to escape.

The new comedy of manners; persistence of Jonsonian comedy in Brome.

Massinger's happy combination of the method and constructive excellence of Jonson with Middleton's freer treatment of subjects derived from daily life has already been adverted to in this résumé. To the *habitué* of the theaters of the time of King Charles, Richard Brome must have bulked large. Though, like the rest, "a limb of Fletcher" in tragicomedy, Brome's comedies, from *The City Wit* (in 1629) to *The Northern Lass* (1632) and *The Jovial Crew* (1641), are Jonsonian through and through, if

lightened of the Jonsonian learning and drastic satire and void of the finer qualities of the master's art. And Brome, as we have already seen, was but one of the dramatical "sons of Ben," the number of which included an earl and many gentlemen, but no cleverer playwright than Brome himself.

Degenerate tragicomedy and the Restoration heroic play.

There remain two great names and one characteristic development of the drama. It has already been affirmed that the distinctive "note" of the drama of the reign of King Charles was a decadent romanticism. The forms which this took were several. Among them was Fletcherian tragicomedy, in the hands of Fletcher's successors mainly repetitious and conventionalized; and the revival by certain minor writers of the heroical romance of impossible adventure in impossible lands, exampled in Kirke's preposterous *Seven Champions of Christendom* (1634) and Lower's *Phœnix in her Flames* (1639). But most important historically was the intermediary drama which, claiming Fletcherian tragicomedy for the chiefest of its forebears, led on through the work of Davenant, and especially of Carlell, to the heroic play of Restoration times. The nature of such plays as Davenant's *Love and Honor* (1634) and his *Fair Favorite* (1638), of Carlell's *Deserving Favorite* (1629), *Passionate Lovers* (1636), and the rest, has already been sufficiently set forth in the foregoing chapter, together with the contrasts between these productions and both the old heroical romance and the true romantic drama. The author, too, has given his reasons for assigning to the Fletcherian method of heightened contrast a chief place in the development of the Restoration heroic play, allowing to the example of French romances, to Shirley's sim-

plified plot, and the contemporary fashion of writing in couplets a subsidiary influence in the evolution, and regarding Carlell and Thomas Killigrew rather than Davenant as the conduits from Fletcher to Orrery and Dryden.

The period of Shirley, 1625–42.

And yet despite this flood of Jonsonian and Fletcherian imitation, the reign of Charles is, above all, the period of Shirley. The art of Ford was subtler, more profound, and more poetic than that of Shirley. Ford saw life neither steadily nor yet as a whole; but he could probe as none before him to the quick the soul of torturer or tortured, dizzily poised by his own or others' passions on the brink of destruction to body and soul. Ford's ponderings on life and conduct are often morbid and his ethics exhibit at times a curious and a dangerous warp, but his power as a dramatic artist and as a poet of the first rank have left us in *'Tis Pity She's a Whore* and in *The Broken Heart* works imperishable among their kind. Ford's tragedies cluster about the early thirties. His success was overpowering, but it was momentary. None in his day followed Ford, and he boasted, not without reason, that he was the disciple of no one. Shirley's career and disposition were very different. From the very year of the accession of King Charles until the Puritan ordinance silenced his Muse, this admirable man labored with steady industry and ready competence to furnish the stage with rational, original, and, for the most part, wholesome entertainment. Shirley is no mere "limb of Fletcher," and the abject follower neither of the unromantic and unsatiric comedy of Middleton nor of the "humors" and preachings of Jonson. Shirley studied the drama that had preceded him to avoid plagiarism, not to

perpetrate it. *The Politician* (1629) may remind the superficial reader of *Hamlet*, and *The Cardinal* (1641) suggest to any one who has read the two plays the major situation of *The Duchess of Malfi*. But how different are Shirley's dramas from their "originals," and how thoroughly, with two superlative dramas of all time for his theme-givers, has Shirley modestly and efficiently maintained his own! Shirley studied the life about him to produce, in such comedies as *The Ball*, *Hyde Park*, and the more sinister *Gamester*, truer pictures of the better society of Carolan London than Middleton or Fletcher ever drew in their comedies of the London of King James. Shirley is, when all has been said, an able, conscientious, and ingenious dramatist, and withal no contemptible poet. Then why, despite his contemporary repute, his failure genuinely to impress either his time or the times to come? A reason is not far to seek. Shirley, coming at the end of a great drama, was eclectic in the practice of his art. He was neither frankly a disciple like Massinger nor daringly an innovator like Ford. The age listened to his plays and measurably liked them. It applauded him when he forced his art down in *The Gamester;* but it liked and applauded still more the obscenities of Brome and Killigrew's daring brutality. It measurably enjoyed the original situations of Shirley's *Opportunity* or the ingenious plotting of his *Coronation;* but its delight was in adventures such as those of Killigrew's Princess Cicilia, "sister to Virgilius, son to Julius Cæsar," and in the insipid intrigues of Carlell's pseudo-romantic tragicomedies with their Platonic and other twaddle. Shirley's were the shortcomings of the moderate man, and his desert is a moderate repute.

Epilogue.

Our task is complete, our journey at an end. This land of Elizabethan drama is a delightful land to dwell in and worthy the traversing of many leagues to see. But as with other lands, the tourist can become little acquainted with it; and it must remain least known to him who hears only the empty echoes of report. For the sojourner here is the fullness of life, for this old drama, like the old London in which it thrived, contains in itself the epitome of Elizabethan England and much besides. There were streets in old London which were as commonplace and dreary as the streets of to-day: we can avoid them on our return. There were localities in the old city which the prudent and the cleanly avoided: there are such spots in the old drama. But there were likewise in old London many noble palaces and structures of beauty, quaint gardens, highways thronged with cheerful and engaging people, and dark, crooked byways in the threading of which the venturesome or those happily yet a little superstitious might experience strange thrills of terror and delight. Such, too, is Elizabethan drama, for here can be beheld in the pomp in which they lived many stately kings and queens, and noble folk whose troubled or heroic lives fret and adorn the annals of time. Here are simple tales of lovers and of parents and children who were lost and found, of country mirth and glee with the hearty humors of the city street, the tavern, and the market-place. Thither adventurers return to recount strange stories of land and sea and tell of deeds of daring and of guile, of devotion, magnanimity, intrigue, revenge, and deviltry. Exhaustless is the range of Elizabethan plot and personage as were the dress, the habits, and lives of those who

crowded the London thoroughfares. Exhaustless, too, is the variety of Elizabethan thought as exemplified in these plays; for the wise and the foolish, the idealist and the sensualist, the man of the street and the philosopher and the poet, each had his hand in the making. To him whose search is for the actualities of Tudor and Stuart life, the living scenes of these old plays offer the very "age, his form and pressure." Nor do they less triumphantly stand the test which we habitually apply to the conduct of men in their relations and obligations and pompously call the philosophy of life. For with all its inequalities and occasional moral lapses, Elizabethan drama is wholesome, judged at large, and free from moral sophistries and conventional ethics. The age turned instinctively to dramatic expression, and hence, with allowance for contemporary methods of staging, the vast majority of Elizabethan plays must have proved theatrically effective while preserving none the less a literary standard unequaled in earlier or in later times. But when all has been said of its universality of appeal, of its spontaneousness and abandon, its uniform adequacy in style and not infrequent literary distinction, the glory of Elizabethan drama abides in its imperishable poetry, which, like the impartial sun, lavishes its light on all subjects, lending dignity and splendor to serious themes and transfiguring many a trifle to a precious possession of unwonted beauty. Elizabethan drama was potent in its time because it expressed to the full the bewildering complexities of Elizabethan life; because, in short, it was a great national utterance. Elizabethan drama continues vital and effective to move us to-day because it combines with essential truth efficient artistry;

because it presents life to us hopefully, not cynically nor pessimistically, and possesses, as few literatures have ever possessed, the power to disclose the world as it is and simultaneously guide the delighted reader to a realization of that world transfigured by the magic of poetry.

# BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ESSAY

THE following paragraphs are offered as a working outline. They are planned to assist the reader who may wish to search somewhat more deeply into the subject, or into parts of it, than the plan of this book permits: their purpose is guidance, not exhaustive information. For this reason previous bibliographies have been for the most part indicated, not incorporated. The arrangement and succession of subjects is that of the subject-matter of this book. A reference to the Index will make the finding of any specific entry comparatively easy. For minor matters the reader is referred by means of the Index to the text, which is furnished throughout with references to the authorities on which the author's opinions or arguments are grounded. Contemporary editions of individual plays will be found, not in this Bibliography, but in the **Index List of Plays**, under title. A few of the works most frequently cited are abbreviated after first mention in this essay, in the notes accompanying the text, and in the List of Plays. The following comprise most of these abbreviations:

*Anglia.* Anglia: Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. 28 vols. 1878 to date. [In progress.]

*Archiv.* (Herrig's) Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen. 115 vols. 1848 to date. [In progress.]

Brandl. Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare, ein Ergänzungsband zu Dodsley's Old English Plays. Herausgegeben von A. Brandl. Strassburg, 1898. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, lxxx.

Brotanek. Die englischen Maskenspiele. R. Brotanek. 1902. Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, xv.

Chambers. The Mediæval Stage. E. K. Chambers. 2 vols. 1903.

Collier. The History of English Dramatic Poetry to the Time of

Shakespeare: and Annals of the Stage to the Restoration. J. P. Collier, 1831. New ed. 1879.

Creizenach. Geschichte des neueren Dramas. W. Creizenach. Vols. i–iii, 1893–1903. [In progress.]

*D. N. B.* Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by L. Stephen and S. Lee. 66 vols. 1885–1901.

Dodsley. A Select Collection of Old English Plays, R. Dodsley. Chronologically arranged, revised and enlarged by W. C. Hazlitt. 4th ed. 15 vols. 1874–76. [Originally issued in 1744.]

*E. E. T. S.* Early English Text Society. Original Series 129 vols. 1864–1905; New Series 93 vols. 1867–1904. [In progress.]

*Engl. Stud.* Englische Studien, Organ für englische Philologie. 37 vols. 1877 to date. [In progress.]

Fleay. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama,1559–1642. F. G. Fleay, 2 vols. 1891.

Fleay, *Stage*. A Chronicle History of the London Stage, 1559–1642. F. G. Fleay, 1890.

Gayley. Representative English Comedies, from the Beginnings to Shakespeare, edited by C. M. Gayley and others, 1903.

Genest. Some Account of the English Stage from the Restoration in 1660 to 1830. J. Genest. 10 vols. Bath, 1832.

Greg I. A List of English Plays written before 1643 and printed before 1700. W. W. Greg. For the Bibliographical Society, 1900.

Greg II. A List of Masques, Pageants, etc., supplementary to a List of English Plays. W. W. Greg. For the Bibliographical Society, 1902.

Henslowe. Henslowe's Diary. Edited by W. W. Greg. 2 vols. 1904. [But one has as yet appeared.]

Herford. The Literary Relations of England and Germany in the Sixteenth Century. C. H. Herford, 1886.

*Jahrbuch*. Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. 42 vols. 1864 to date. [In progress.]

Koeppel I. Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Ben Jonson's, John Marston's und Beaumont's und Fletcher's, von E. Koeppel, Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie, xi, 1895.

Koeppel II. Quellen Studien zu den Dramen George Chapman's, Philip Massinger's und John Ford's, von E. Koeppel. Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, lxxxii, 1897.

Langbaine. Some Account of English Dramatick Poets. G. Langbaine, 1691.

Lee. A Life of William Shakespeare. S. Lee. 1898; 5th ed. 1905.

Malone. Plays and Poems of William Shakspeare with the Corrections and Illustrations of Various Commentators. E. Malone, 21 vols. 1821.

*Mod. Lang. Notes.* Modern Language Notes, a monthly publication, devoted to the interests of the Academic Study of English, German, and Romance Languages. 22 vols. 1886 to date. [In progress.]

*Mod. Lang. Publ.* Publications and Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America. 22 vols. 1884 to date. [In progress.]

*Mod. Phil.* Modern Philology. 4 vols. 1902 to date. [In progress.]

*New Sh. Soc. Trans.* New Shakspere Society's Publications and Transactions, 1874–96.

Nichols, *Elizabeth.* Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth. With historical notes, etc. J. Nichols. 2d ed. 3 vols. 1823.

Nichols, *James.* Progresses, Processions, and Festivities of James I his Court, etc. J. Nichols. 4 vols. 1828.

*Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* Shakespeare Society's Papers and Publications. 48 vols. 1841–53.

Oliphant. The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher. E. H. Oliphant, Englische Studien, xiv, xv, xvi, 1890–92.

Ordish. Early London Theatres (In the Fields). T. F. Ordish, 1894. [The Camden Library.]

*Outlines.* Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare. J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps. 9th ed. 2 vols. 1892.

Pollard. English Miracle Plays, Moralities, and Interludes. A. W. Pollard. 3d ed. 1898.

*Revels.* Extracts from the Accounts of Revels at Court in the Reigns of Elizabeth and King James I. P. Cunningham. Shakespeare Society. 1842.

*S. R.* A Transcript of the Register of the Company of Stationers of London, 1554–1640. E. Arber. 5 vols. 1875–1894.

Thorndike. The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere. A. H. Thorndike, Worcester, Mass., 1901.

Warburton. A List of Old Dramas in Manuscript, the Property of William Warburton, destroyed about 1750 by a servant. Gentleman's Magazine, 1815, ii, 217.

Ward. A History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne. A. W. Ward. 2d ed. 3 vols. 1899.

No general bibliography of the English drama exists except *English Drama, a Working Basis*, by K. L. Bates and L. B. Godfrey, 1896, a somewhat unequal attempt to cover the entire field. The subject, however, forms a part of the plan of various *Grundrisse* with which German industry has from time to time furnished the scholarly world; such as that of G. Körting, *Grundriss der Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*, 3d ed. 1899; and that of H. Paul, *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, new ed. 1896–1903, in which, however, modern drama has not yet been reached. On matters involving "comparative literature" the student is referred to the excellent volume of L. P. Betz, *La Littérature Comparée*, 1900, new ed. 1904.

For the bibliography of printed plays we are much better off, as lists have been printed from time to time from a period soon after the Restoration. Such publishers' lists of plays as those of Rogers and Ley, 1656; Archer, 1656; F. Kirkman, 1661 and 1671; W. Mears, 1726; and T. Whincop, 1747; with W. Winstanley's *Lives of the Most Famous Poets*, 1687, are historically curious. The important matter of the earlier ones has been excerpted by W. W. Greg, in the appendices to his *List of Masques*, 1902. *Some Account of English Dramatick Poets*, by G. Langbaine, 1691, is the first serious attempt at a dictionary of English plays, and is an excellent old compendium for its day. Among later works of this type may be mentioned *Biographia Dramatica*, first published by D. E. Baker in 1764, continued by I. Reed in 1782 and by S. Jones in 1812. This work was rewritten, if not improved, by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps in 1860, under title *A Dictionary of Old Plays. A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama*, by F. G. Fleay, 2 vols., 1891, comprises not only bibliographical material, but biographical and critical as well, and is indispensable, however vexatious at times in its conjectures and contradictions. An independent work of a purely bibliographical character is *A Manual for the Collector and Amateur of Old English Plays*, by W. C. Hazlitt,

1892. Our latest acquisitions in this kind are the two admirable bibliographies: *A List of English Plays written before* 1643 *and published before* 1700; and the supplementary *List of Masques and Pageants*, compiled by W. W. Greg and published, in 1900 and 1902 respectively, for the Bibliographical Society. The *Lords Mayors' Pageants* were listed in 1831 for the Percy Society by D. G. Nichols. For a list of minor play-lists and dictionaries of the drama the curious may be referred to *Notes and Queries*, fifth series, xii, 203. Further bibliographies of earlier editions of the drama may be culled from works of a more general nature, such as J. P. Collier's *Bibliographical and Critical Account of the Rarest Books in the English Language*, 4 vols., 1865; and W. C. Hazlitt's *Handbook to the Popular and Dramatic Literature of Great Britain*, with its successive Supplements, from 1867 to 1890; and from the bibliographies appended to the histories of literature which it is becoming more and more the fashion to write. See, also, R. W. Lowe, *A Bibliographical Account of English Theatrical Literature*, 1887, and the "Bibliography of the English Drama," contributed to *The Antiquary*, xx, 1889. The starting-point of all original bibliographical inquiry into Tudor and Stuart literature is of course *The Register of the Stationers' Company*, 1554–1640, a transcript of which, in 5 vols., 1875–1894, has been furnished by the self-abnegating industry of E. Arber.

For the **biographies of English dramatists** as of other Englishmen of note, the standard authority is *The Dictionary of National Biography*, 1885–1901, edited by L. Stephen and S. Lee, and the work of experts in each topic. This work has practically incorporated the material of the several biographical dictionaries of the drama that preceded it (the chief of which have just been mentioned above), with newer material, biographical and historical. Fleay's *Biographical Chronicle* contains, besides what has been thus incorporated, much other matter of value; and J. P. Collier's "Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare," *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1846, with

other publications for the same society, such as *Henslowe's Diary*, *The Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, *The Alleyn Papers*, and other works should be consulted. *The Lives of British Dramatists*, 2 vols., 1837, by S. A. Dunham, is of minor importance.

As to **texts of the drama**, aside from the separate editions of individual poets which will find mention in their places below, the following are the more important collections of old English plays: *Dodsley's Old Plays*, first published, 12 vols. in 1744, enlarged by I. Reed in 1780, again by J. P. Collier in 1825–27, and lastly chronologically arranged by Hazlitt, 15 vols., 1874–76; *Bell's British Theatre*, 34 vols., 1797, with a Supplement in 6 vols. soon after; Sir Walter Scott's *Ancient and Modern British Drama*, together 8 vols., 1810–11; *The Old English Drama*, by Baldwyn, 2 vols., 1824; T. White, *Old English Drama*, 4 vols., 1830; J. S. Keltie, *Works of the British Dramatists*, 1870. Supplements to Dodsley are those of C. W. Dilke, *Old English Plays*, 6 vols., 1814–15; J. P. Collier, *Five Old Plays*, *Roxburghe Club*, 1833; T. Amyot and others, *A Supplement to Dodsley's Old English Plays*, 4 vols., 1853; and A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare*, *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxx, 1898. Exceedingly valuable, too, are the reprints of old and sometimes hitherto unpublished dramas by A. H. Bullen, *Old English Plays*, 4 vols., 1882; and a second, new series, 3 vols., 1889. Other works of wider contents, if less critical value, are the compendious old collections of Mrs. Inchbald, 42 vols., 1808–11; of W. Oxberry, 22 vols., 1818–25; and of J. Cumberland, 44 vols., 1829. Of a more scholarly and restricted character are T. Hawkins, *Origin of the English Drama*, 3 vols., 1773; *Six Old Plays*, 1779; and *Four Old Plays*, the latter edited by F. J. Child, 1848. J. Maidment and W. H. Logan, *Dramatists of the Restoration*, 14 vols., 1872–79, reprint the works of several late dramatic authors the work of whom falls in part within the period of this book. To R. Simpson, however eccentric some of his views,

we owe reprints of several rare early plays in his *School of Shakspere*, 2 vols., 1878. Excellent, if popular, is the *Mermaid Series of the Best Plays of the Old Dramatists*, projected by J. A. Symonds, 1886, and now containing 23 vols., the work of various editors. H. M. Fitzgibbon, *Famous Elizabethan Plays*, 1889, and W. R. Thayer, *The Best Elizabethan Plays*, 1890, are popular collections in one volume each. Besides their limited choice of material, both are open to criticism, like most of the previous collections, on the score of a modernized text. Of collected extracts from the dramatists, Charles Lamb's *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets*, 1808 (new ed. by I. Gollancz, 2 vols., 1893), holds the place of honor for the occasional jewels of precious critical insight which it contains. A recent book of similar plan is that of W. H. Williams, *Specimens of Elizabethan Drama from Lyly to Shirley*, 1905; another is G. E. and W. H. Hadow's *Oxford Treasury of English Literature*, 1907, the second vol. of which concerns the drama. In J. M. Manly's *Specimens of Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, 2 vols., 1897, the choice is extended, the texts complete, and reproduced with scholarly care. The same may be affirmed of C. M. Gayley's *Representative English Comedies*, edited by various hands, 1903. *The Temple Dramatists*, begun in 1895, and edited by I. Gollancz, includes, besides Shakespeare, upwards of a score of plays the works of other dramatists, singly edited and separately published. *The Belles Lettres Series of English Dramas*, under the general editorship of G. P. Baker, 1902; and the series founded by W. Bang in the same year and entitled *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas*, are both marked by careful scholarship and are likewise still in progress. A reversion to the vicious habit of a modernized and sophisticated text has recently marked the appearance of the *Publications of the Early English Drama Society*, edited by J. S. Farmer, 1906; but better things are promised for the future. Sounder methods prevail in the work of *The Malone Society*, founded in 1906,

the Honorary Secretary of which is W. W. Greg. The four volumes which have already appeared are mentioned, each in its place, below.

Among **histories of the modern drama** the authoritative one is that of W. Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, 1893 to date and still in continuance. R. Prölss, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, 3 vols., 1881–83, is a work of less importance, while J. L. Klein's large *Geschichte des Dramas*, 13 vols., 1865–79, is prolix and to a considerable degree now antiquated. The chief authority for the general **history of the English drama** is A. W. Ward, *History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne*, 2 vols. 1871, 2d ed. 3 vols. 1899. J. P. Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, first printed in 1831, new ed. 1879, contains much material which is accessible nowhere else; but from the untrustworthiness of the author, must be followed with the utmost caution. A more recent work is that of J. J. Jusserand, *Le Théâtre en Angleterre*, new ed. 1881. The conclusions of this work have been for the most part incorporated in the same author's *Literary History of the English People*, 4 vols., 1895–1904, and still in progress. The history of English drama in whole or in part forms, too, a portion of the more general histories of English literature and poetry, such as that of T. Warton, *History of English Poetry*, first published in 1774–81, new ed. by Hazlitt, 4 vols., 1871; H. A. Taine, *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise*, 4 vols., 1863, English translation, 1872; G. Saintsbury, *History of Elizabethan Literature*, 1887; H. Morley, *English Writers*, 11 vols., 1887–95; B. Ten Brink, *Geschichte der englischen Litteratur*, first published in 1877, new ed. by A. Brandl, 1893, English translation, 1884–96; W. J. Courthope's notable *History of English Poetry*, 5 vols., 1895–1905, and still in progress; G. Saintsbury, *Short History of English Literature*, 1895, and many more. The history of English drama in the time of Shakespeare is the theme of several excellent older works: N. Drake, *Shakspeare and his Times*, 1817; W. Hazlitt, *Dra-*

*matic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth*, 1821; H. Ulrici, *Ueberblick über die Geschichte des englischen Dramas*, 1847; F. R. G. Guizot's *Shakespeare et son Temps*, 1852; translated, 1855; F. M. von Bodenstedt's *Shakespeare's Zeitgenossen und ihre Werke*, 1856–60; A. J. F. Mézières' excellent *Contemporaines et Successeurs de Shakespeare*, 1864; and E. P. Whipple, *Literature of the Age of Elizabeth*, 1869. A later suggestive book is J. A. Symonds' *Shakspere's Predecessors in the English Drama*, 1881; A. F. von Schack, *Die englischen Dramatiker vor, neben, und nach Shakspere*, 1893; and J. C. Collins, "The Predecessors of Shakespeare," *Essays and Studies*, 1895, are valuable, too; F. S. Boas, *Shakspere and his Predecessors*, 1896, is a slighter work. C. M. Gayley's *Representative English Comedies*, 1903, like several of the older collections of plays, contains much valuable critical and historical material in the form of introductions, prefaces, notes, and other apparatus. J. R. Lowell's *Old Dramatists*, 1902, is distinctly below his usual critical acumen. Among several recent histories may be mentioned *The Age of Shakespeare*, by T. Seccombe and J. W. Allen, 1901, the second vol. of which is concerned with the drama. For the history of the stage, the reader is referred to the paragraphs of this essay which correspond to chapter iv of this book. References to other specific material will likewise be found below.

For the bibliography of the critical literature of the drama we are less well off, and such matter is best gleaned from the incidental bibliographies and mentions contained in works on more specific parts of the subject. Lists of new books, appended to many of the scientific periodicals devoted to the study of English and other modern tongues, and the annual résumés of contemporary critical activity such as the *Jahresbericht der germanischen Philologie*, twenty-sixth year, 1905; that of the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, or of *Anglia*, afford the scholar material aid in keeping abreast of the times. The more important journals and collections of papers and reprints that include a consideration of the

English drama are the following: *Shakespeare Society, Papers and Publications*, 1844–53; (Herrig's) *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 1848–; *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Litteratur*, 1859–76; *Jahrbuch der deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft*, 1865–; *Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker*, 1874–; *New Shakspere Society, Publications and Transactions*, 1874–96; *Englische Studien*, 1877–; *Anglia, Zeitschrift für englische Philologie*, 1878–; *Litteraturbibliothek für germanische und romanische Philologie* (monthly), 1879–; *American Journal of Philology*, 1880–; *Publications and Transactions of the Modern Language Association of America*, 1884–; *Modern Language Notes* (monthly), 1886–; *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, 1887–; *Münchener Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie*, 1890–; *Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie*, 1895–; *Forschungen zur neueren Litteraturgeschichte*, 1896–; *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, 1897–; *Journal of (English) and Germanic Philology*, 1897–; *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, 1897–; *Modern Language Quarterly*, 1897–1902; *Palæstra, Untersuchungen und Texte aus der deutschen und englischen Philologie*, 1898–; *Modern Philology*, 1902–; *Materialien zur Kunde des älteren englischen Dramas*, 1902–; *Journal of Comparative Literature*, 1903; *Modern Language Review*, 1905, successor of *The Modern Language Quarterly*, named above.

## I. THE OLD SACRED DRAMA

Owing to the solidarity of the Medieval Church in Western Europe, the origins of the sacred drama are best studied with the lines of nationality to a large extent disregarded. Aside from the excellent work of Creizenach in the first two volumes of his *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, the authoritative book is that of E. K. Chambers, *The Mediæval Stage*, 2 vols., 1903, a valuable feature of which is the ample

bibliography with which it is furnished. (See, also, the additional bibliography by D. Klein, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 1905.) The subject is more briefly treated in "The Transition Period," by G. Gregory Smith, *Epochs of European Culture*, 1900; and in the general histories of literature and the drama. See, too, the article of B. Matthews, "The Mediæval Drama," *Mod. Phil.* i, 1903. **The liturgical origins of the drama** are especially the theme of C. Magnin's *Origines du Théâtre*, 1846–47; of the Introduction to E. Du Méril's *Origines latines du Théâtre moderne*, 1849; of M. Sepet's *Origines catholiques du Théâtre moderne*, 1901; and of the same author's *Le Drame chrétien au Moyen Age*, 1878. C. Davidson's *Studies in the English Mystery Plays*, 1892, contains much that is valuable. See, also, the article of M. Bateson, "The Mediæval Stage," *Scottish Historical Review*, July, 1904. The texts of the **Quem Quaeritis** may be studied in T. Wright, *Early Mysteries and other Latin Poems*, 1838; in Du Méril as above; in G. Milchsack, *Die Oster- und Passionsspiele*, 1880; in C. Lange, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern*, 1887; and L. Wirth, *Die Oster- und Passionsspiele bis zum XVI Jahrhundert*, 1889; E. de Coussemaker, *Drames liturgiques du Moyen Age*, 1860, gives the music as well as the text. R. Froning, *Das Drama des Mittelalters*, 1891, includes the *Antichristus*. The tropes will be found in L. Gautier, *Histoire de la Poésie liturgique au Moyen Age*, 1886, and W. H. Frere, *The Winchester Tropes*, 1894. Convenient reprints of these as of other specimens of the old sacred drama are contained in J. M. Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, 1897, vol. i. The liturgical plays of Hilarius were published by J. J. Champollion-Figeac, *Hilarii Versus et Ludi*, 1838; a more accessible account of Hilarius is that of H. Morley, *English Writers*, vol. iii.

An effort towards a **general bibliography of the English miracle plays** is that of F. H. Stoddard, *References for Students of Miracle Plays and Mysteries*, 1887; another is contained in K. L. Bates, *The English Religious Drama*,

1893. By far the most complete is that of Chambers, in the Appendices to his second volume. The best accounts of the English miracle play are those of Ten Brink, Ward, and Creizenach as above, and the Introductions of A. W. Pollard, *English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes* (3d ed. 1898); and of C. M. Gayley, *Representative English Comedies*, 1903. See, also, this author's "The Earlier," and "The Later Miracle Plays in England," *The International Quarterly*, x and xii, 1904 and 1906; and the Harvard Thesis, by F. M. Tisdel, *Comedy in the Mystery Plays of England*, 1906. Besides Collier, now superseded, and Symonds', Jusserand's, Courthope's, and others' histories of literature and poetry, the topic is especially treated by K. L. Bates, *The English Religious Drama*, 1893. Earlier English learning on the subject may be found in T. Warton, *History of English Poetry* (ed. Hazlitt, 1871); in E. Malone, *Historical Account of the English Stage*, his Variorum Shakspeare, 1821, vol. iii; in W. Hone, *Ancient Mysteries Described*, 1823; and in the *Dissertation* of the antiquary T. Sharp, *On the Pageants or Dramatic Mysteries anciently performed at Coventry*, 1825. Earlier German interest in the subject is manifest by A. Ebert, "Die englischen Mysterien," *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Litteratur*, i, 1859. A few later contributions are: R. Brotanek, "The Dublin *Abraham and Isaac*," *Anglia*, xxi, 1898; F. Liebermann, "Das Osterspiel zu Leicester," *Archiv*, cvii, 1900; M. Peacock, "The Wakefield Mysteries, their Place of Representation," *Anglia*, xxiv, 1901; W. van der Gaaf, "Miracles and Mysteries of S. E. Yorkshire," *Engl. Stud.* xxvi, 1906. A recent popular work on the general subject is that of E. H. Moore, *English Miracle Plays and Moralities*, 1907.

The following are the editions of the four great cycles of miracle plays: *The York Plays*, edited by L. Toulmin Smith, 1885; the *Towneley (or Wakefield) Plays*, by an editor unknown, for the *Surtees Society*, 1836, and by G. England and A. W. Pollard, *E. E. T. S.* 1897; the *Ches-*

*ter Plays*, by T. Wright, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1843–47, and by H. Deimling in part, *E. E. T. S.* 1893; the *Ludus Coventriae*, by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1841. Most of these editions are furnished with valuable introductory matter. A collection miscellaneous in character and consisting of late plays has been printed from the *Digby Manuscript* in the Bodleian Library by T. Sharp for the *Abbotsford Club*, 1835, and by F. J. Furnivall, *New Sh. Soc.* 1882, and *E. E. T. S.* 1896. The Cornish cycle was published with a translation by E. Norris, *The Ancient Cornish Drama*, 1859. See, also, T. C. Peter, *The Old Cornish Drama, a Lecture*, 1907.

On the relations of the English miracle-cycles, A. Hohlfeld, "Die altenglischen Kollektivemisterien," *Anglia*, xi, 1889, should be consulted; on the sources of the York Plays, P. Kamen, in the same, x, 1888; and on those of the Chester Plays, H. Ungemach, in *Münchener Beiträge*, i, 1890. The Dissertation of K. Schmidt, *Die Digby-Spiele*, 1884, and A. Bunzen, *Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Wakefielder Mysterien*, 1903, are neither of them important. F. Holthausen has contributed to a clarification of the text of the *York Plays* in Herrig's *Archiv*, lxxxv-lxxxvi, 1890–91. See, also, his "Zur Textkritik der York Plays," *Philologische Studien, Festgabe für E. Sievers*, 1896; "Studien zum älteren englischen Drama," *Engl. Stud.* xxxi, 1902, and other works; and Davidson's *Studies*, 1892, as above, which contains, besides much else, an important contribution to the vexed subject of the meters of the miracle. Finally, in H. S. Symmes, *Les Débuts de la Critique Dramatique en Angleterre*, 1903, will be found valuable material concerning the attitude of the clergy towards the drama.

On the authorship of the miracle plays the reader should consult an interesting paragraph of Chambers, vol. ii. Our chief authority for the life and dramatic writings of John Bale is contained in his own works, especially his *Illustrium Majoris Britanniæ Scriptorum Catalogus*, 1548, and 1557–

59, and his "Vocacyon to Ossory," *Harleian Miscellany*, ed. 1808, vol. i. Later accounts of Bale are those of Collier, Ward, Cooper's *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, and that of M. Creighton in the *D. N. B.* Bibliographies of Bale's dramatic writings may be found in the Introduction to M. M. Schroeer's edition of his *Comedy Concerning Three Laws*, 1882, and in Chambers. See, also, the contributions of W. Bang, *Engl. Stud.* xxxiv, 1904–05. The best account of **George Buchanan** is that of Æ. Mackay in *D. N. B.* See, also, G. A. Morton, *George Buchanan, a Biography*, 1906; and the *Glasgow Quartercentenary Studies*, also 1906. The best edition of his works is that of Thomas Ruddiman, 1725; the reprint of 1735 contains a full bibliography. The biblical plays of Buchanan have been frequently translated into English; both of them by A. Gibb in 1870; *Jephthes*, by A. G. Mitchell, 1903, and both again by A. Brown, into verse, 1907. A special if questionable interest attaches to the translation of *Baptistes* attributed to Milton. On the topic, see F. Peck's *New Memoir of Milton*, 1740. Ochino's tragedy, as translated by Bishop Ponet, 1549, has been edited by C. E. Plumtre, 1899; M. W. Wallace edits Arthur Golding's translation of Beza's *Abraham's Sacrifice*, 1907. The chief points in the life of **Nicholas Grimald** are epitomized by E. Arber in his edition of *Tottel's Miscellany;* by E. Flügel in Gayley, and by Chambers. On his place in the drama, see Herford. Aside from the reprint of *Christus Redivivus*, by J. M. Hart, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xiv, 1899, *Archipropheta* has been recently translated, 1907. W. W. Greg reprints for the Malone Society the *Enterlude of Johan Baptistes*, 1906. *Acolastus*, its author, and translator, are also treated by Herford. Bale is our authority for Radclif. For references to the lesser authors named in the chapter corresponding to this section of the bibliographical essay the reader is referred to the notes accompanying that chapter, and to the list of authors below. For further authorities on the humanists' drama see the next section of this essay.

## II. THE MORALITY AND THE EARLIER SECULAR DRAMA

Historical accounts of the **English moralities** are contained in the larger histories of literature and the drama, such as Klein, Collier, Ten Brink, Symonds, Creizenach, Jusserand, and Courthope. They are likewise specifically treated by Pollard, Bates, Gayley, and Chambers, for all of which see the preceding sections of this essay. The Introduction to A. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas in England vor Shakespeare*, 1898, adds much matter and some surmise. **Texts of the moralities** are available in Dodsley's *Old English Plays* (ed. Hazlitt, 1874–76), the earlier volumes; in extract in A. W. Pollard, *English Miracle Plays, Moralities and Interludes* (3d ed. 1898); J. M. Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, 1897, vol. i; in Brandl, *Quellen* (as above); and in some of the older collections of early plays mentioned above, such as F. Hawkins, *Origin of the English Drama*, 3 vols., 1773; J. P. Collier, *Five Old Plays*, 1833; and F. J. Child, *Four Old Plays*, 1848. An excellent **bibliography of the English morality** is contained in Chambers, ii, 436.

**Bibliographies of the Feast of Fools,** and of the **Boy Bishop** will be found in Chambers (vol. i, 274 and 336), where, too, as in Creizenach, these subjects are thoroughly discussed. On the latter topic in England, see A. F. Leach, "The Schoolboys' Feast," *Fortnightly Review*, n. s. lix, 1896; and the material gathered by E. F. Rimbault, "The Festival of the Boy Bishop in England," *Camden Miscellany*, vii, 1875. For the whole question of the **folk drama**, which lies beyond the purpose of these volumes, the reader is once more referred to Chambers and his admirable bibliographies. On old English customs, J. Brand, *Observations on Popular Antiquities*, 1770 (new ed. by W. C. Hazlitt, 1870); T. F. T. Dyer, *British Popular Customs*, 1891, and P. H. Ditchfield, *Old English Customs*, 1896, are popular and valuable, if scarcely scientific works.

The sword-dance is elaborately studied by K. Müllenhoff, "Ueber den Schwerttanz," *Festgaben für Gustav Homeyer*, 1871, and in *Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum*, xviii. For the morris dance, see F. Douce, *Illustrations of Shakspeare*, 1807 (new ed. 1839), and A. Burton, *Rushbearing*, 1891. The subject of **medieval minstrelsy** is likewise well treated and at large by Chambers, where sufficient bibliographies of the subject will be found.

On the **dialogue** at large the chief authority is R. Hirzel, *Der Dialog, ein litterarhistorischer Versuch*, 1895. An interesting account of the medieval dialogue in its international relations is contained in Herford as above. Specimens of the medieval dialogue may be found in K. Böddeker, *Altenglische Dichtungen*, 1878; W. C. Hazlitt, *Remains of the Early Popular Poetry of England*, 4 vols., 1864–66, and other like collections. On the mummers' plays, see T. F. Ordish, "English Folk Drama," *Folk-Lore*, ii, iv, 1891, 1893. Chambers gives a list of these productions, vol. i, 203. On the mummings of Lydgate, see R. Brotanek, *Die englischen Maskenspiele*, 1902; and E. P. Hammond, in *Anglia*, xxii, 1899, and xxviii, 1905. The original sources of our information concerning early royal masking will be found in the various volumes of the *Calendar of State Papers*, especially *Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII* (1862–1903); the *Revels' Accounts;* and *The King's Book of Payments;* in the *Chronicles* of Hall, *The Union of Lancaster and York*, 1548, ed. 1809; and in A. J. Kempe, *The Loseley Manuscripts*, 1836. Collier's "Annals of the Stage" in his *History of English Dramatic Poetry*, 1831, new ed. 1879, now becomes useful despite its defects; and W. C. Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage*, 1869, supplies reprints of several interesting documents. For the *Interludium de Clerico et Puella*, see Chambers, vol. ii; and Jusserand, *Literary History*, vol. i. For the French analogues of this fragment of the early secular drama, see G. B. Bapst, *Essai sur l'Histoire du Théâtre*, 1893, and Creizenach, vol. i.

For the **humanists' drama** see, besides Creizenach, W. Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, 1890–92; and especially C. H. Herford, *Studies in the Literary Relations of England and Germany*, 1886. G. Saintsbury's *The Earlier Renaissance*, 1901 (chapter vi), is a more popular work. On the general subject of the continental humanists, see L. D. Bahlmann, *Die Erneuerer des antiken Dramas und ihre ersten dramatischen Versuche*, 1314–1478, 1896; and *Die lateinischen Dramen*, 1480–1550, 1893. Reprints of many of these Latin plays, by J. Bolte and others, will be found in *Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler des XV and XVI Jahrhunderts*, 1901, to date. Accounts of early English Latin plays at the English universities will be found in an anonymous article in the *Retrospective Review*, xii, 1826. A Harvard thesis reported as of "unusual quality" is that of C. F. Brown, *A Study of the English Drama Schools before the Reformation*, 1906. For later Latin plays at the universities, see the authorities mentioned in section xiv of this Essay.

As to the influence of Plautus and Seneca on earlier English drama, the reader is referred below, section x of this Essay. Features of the vernacular comedy element in early drama are discussed by L. W. Cushman, "The Devil and the Vice," *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, vi, 1900; and by E. Eckert, "Die lustige Person in älteren englischen Dramen," *Palæstra*, xvii, 1902.

*The Pride of Life*, *Mankind*, *Nature and Respublica*, each therein reprinted, receive specific treatment by A. Brandl in his *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas*, 1898. For the first of these, see, also, H. Morley, *English Writers*, vii, 173. Pollard describes and prints a fragment of *The Castle of Perseverance;* the diagram of the playing place is reproduced from the original manuscript by T. Sharp, *A Dissertation on Pageants*, 1825. *Mind, Will, and Understanding* was most recently reprinted by F. J. Furnivall with the *Digby Plays*, 1882. *Wealth and Health* is reprinted by P. Simpson, for the *Malone Society*, 1907. *The World and*

*the Child* and several other moralities are edited by Manly, *Specimens* (as above). *Everyman* has been frequently reprinted: by H. Logemann, edited with the Dutch *Elckerlijk*, 1892; by T. Sidgwick, 1902; A. W. Pollard in *Fifteenth Century Prose and Verse*, 1903; by M. J. Moses, 1903; by W. W. Greg in *Materialien zur Kunde*, iv, 1904; and by Farmer in *Early Dramatists*, *Anonymous Plays*, series i, 1905. On the relations of *Everyman* to the Dutch versions, see H. Logemann's ed. as above; K. H. de Raaf, *Spyeghel der Salicheyt van Elckerlijk*, 1897; Logemann's reply, *Elckerlijc-Everyman, de vraag naar de prioriteit opnieuw onderzocht*, 1902. On the wider relations of the same, see K. Gödeke, *Everyman, Homulus, and Hekastus*, 1865; and A. Roersch, "Elckerlijc-Everyman-Homulus," *Archiv*, cxiii, 1904.

*Hickscorner*, *Youth*, and *The Nature of the Four Elements* are all contained in Dodsley, and *Youth* with fragments of the *Play of Lucre* and *Nature* are reprinted by W. Bang and R. B. McKerrow, *Materialien zur Kunde*, xii, 1905. The last has been most recently reprinted by J. Fischer in *Marburger Studien*, v, 1903. Redford's *Wit and Science* is in the *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1848. Its relations to other like moralities is discussed by J. Seifert, *Wit- und Science-Moralitäten*, 1892. H. Fernow discusses the late moralities of Robert Wilson in his edition of *The Three Lords and Ladies of London*, 1885. On other moralities mentioned, see the résumés of Chambers and the notes to the text. As to the more important authors of the moralities, for Bale see the previous section of this Essay. The standard edition of **John Skelton** is that of A. Dyce, 2 vols., 1843; it contains an excellent memoir. Older authorities will be found cited in S. Lee's article in *D. N. B.* Recent studies are those of A. Kölbing, *Zur Charakteristik John Skelton's*, 1904; and F. Brie, "Skelton-Studien," *Engl. Stud.* xxxvii, 1907. The best editions of **Sir David Lyndsay** are those of Chalmers, 3 vols., 1806; and D. Laing, 3 vols., 1879; to each a life of the poet is prefixed; the

ed. of Lyndsay undertaken by the *E. E. T. S.* in 1865 includes *A Satire of the Three Estates*, 1894.

The latest account of **John Heywood** is that of A. W. Pollard in Gayley's *Representative English Comedies*, 1903. The article by Pollard in *D. N. B.;* and the older *Heywood als Dramatiker*, by W. Swoboda, *Wiener Beiträge*, 1888, should also be consulted. W. W. Greg, in *Archiv*, cvi, 1899, tells of "an unknown ed." of *The Play of Love*. K. Young, in *Modern Philology*, i, 1903–04, discourses on *The Influence of French Farce upon the Plays of Heywood;* and A. Brandl discusses the interlude *Love* and its relations in his *Quellen Studien*, 1898. See, also, F. Holthausen, "Zu Heywood's Wetterspiel," *Archiv*, cxvi, 1906. Heywood's works have been recently collected by J. S. Farmer in a reprint of unauthoritative editions among the *Publications of the Early English Drama Society*, and a study is promised for a future volume by the same editor. Besides the accounts of these authors in *D. N. B.*, for John Rastell, see *Athenæ Oxonienses*, vol. i; for George Ferrers, A. J. Kempe, *The Loseley MS.* 1836; for Thomas Preston, Cooper's *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, ii, 247, 550, and T. Harwood's *Alumni Etonenses*, 1797. Of the plays mentioned among the "first regular" comedies, *Misogonus* is discussed by A. Brandl in *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas*, 1898 (and see G. L. Kittredge, "Misogonus and Laurence Johnson," *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iii, 1901); *Tom Tyler* is reprinted by F. E. Schelling, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xv, 1900; A. S. W. Rosenbach discussed "The Influence of the *Celestina* in the Early English Drama," *Jahrbuch*, xxxix, 1903; and F. Holthausen disclosed the "Sources of *Thersites* in Textor," *Engl. Stud.* xxxi, 1901.

On the disputed authorship of **Gammer Gurton**, see I. Reed in *Biographia Dramatica*, ed. 1782, *s. v.;* C. M. Ross in *Anglia*, xix, 1896; and H. Bradley in Gayley's *Representative English Comedies*, 1903. On the equally disputed date of **Roister Doister**, J. W. Hales in *Engl. Stud.* xviii, 1893; and E. Flügel in Gayley, who has col-

lected, both here and in the *Furnivall Miscellany*, 1901, much valuable material from *Archæologia*, xxi, and elsewhere. See, also, the briefer account of Udall and his work by H. W. Williams and P. A. Robins in their edition of *Roister Doister*, *Temple Dramatists*, 1901; and some additional notes of the former in *Engl. Stud.* xxxvi, 1906. An earlier account of Udall is that of Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, 1861.

## III. EARLY DRAMAS OF SCHOOL AND COURT

The larger histories of literature and of the drama continue available throughout this and subsequent periods. A list of them will be found in the earlier paragraphs of this Essay. For the Italian nature of the **renaissance in England**, the reader is referred to M. Creighton, *The Early Renaissance in England*, 1895; G. Saintsbury, *The Earlier Renaissance*, 1898; and L. Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England*, 1902. On the personal character of **Queen Elizabeth** as affecting the drama, see the contemporary estimates of William Camden, *Annals*, 1615 (3d translated edition by R. Norton, 1635); and that of Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke, in his *Life of Sidney*, ed. 1652, new ed. by A. B. Grosart, in *Fuller Worthies' Library*, 4 vols., 1870. Among the many excellent lives of the queen may be mentioned that of A. Jessopp in *D. N. B.;* E. S. Beesley, *Elizabeth*, in *Twelve English Statesmen*, 1892; M. Creighton, *Queen Elizabeth*, 1896; and the wider treatment of her reign by A. D. Innes, "England under the Tudors," in *A History of England*, 6 vols., edited by C. W. C. Oman, 1905. The progresses and other entertainments of the queen are recorded in the monumental work of J. Nichols, *Progresses and Public Processions of Queen Elizabeth*, 2d ed. 3 vols., 1823, which collects and reprints many contemporary accounts of these august functions. *Queen Elizabeth's Non-dramatic Englishings* were printed for the *E. E. T. S.* 1899; a chorus of the *Hercules Œtæus*, trans-

lated by the royal hand, is reprinted in *Anglia*, xiv, 1892. **Elizabethan translations of Seneca** by various hands between 1559 and 1581 were collected and completed in the latter year by Thomas Newton, reprinted for the *Spenser Society*, 2 vols., 1887. **Thomas Sackville** has been treated by W. D. Cooper in the edition of *Gorboduc* for the *Sh. Soc.* 1847, and by L. T. Smith in *Englische Sprach- und Litteraturdenkmale*, i, 1883. See, also, *Ferrex and Porrex, eine litterarhistorische Untersuchung*, F. Koch, Halle Dissertation, 1881, and F. Liebermann, in *Archiv*, cvi, 1899; **George Gascoigne**, by E. Arber, "Chronicle of the Life, Works, and Times of Gascoigne," *English Reprints*, 1868; unsatisfactorily by W. C. Hazlitt, *Complete Works of Gascoigne*, 2 vols., 1869–70; by F. E. Schelling, "The Life and Writings of George Gascoigne," *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, 1893; and by J. W. Cunliffe in his ed. of *Supposes* and *Jocasta*, *Belles Lettres Series*, 1906. Both of the latter contain bibliographies of Gascoigne. See, too, the excellent article on *The Glass of Government*, by C. H. Herford, *Engl. Stud.* ix, 1886. **Thomas Hughes** and his fellows receive the attention of H. C. Grumbine in the Introduction to his edition of *The Misfortunes of Arthur*, *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, xiv, 1900. On **the influence of Seneca upon Elizabethan tragedy**, see the valuable thesis of J. W. Cunliffe of that title, 1893; on the wider results of that influence, the equally valuable *Zur Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie*, by R. Fischer, of the same year. Cunliffe also contributes a paper on *Gismond of Salerne* to *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xxi, 1906. See, also, below, section xiii of this Essay.

The best accounts of the **Office of the Revels** will be found in Collier and Ward, *s. v.*, in the lives of Sir Edmund Tylney, Sir George Buc, and Sir Henry Herbert in *D. N. B.*, and in R. W. Bond, *Works of John Lyly*, 1902, vol. i. *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court between* 1571 *and* 1588 were published by P. Cunningham, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1842, and the volume contains much valuable ma-

terial despite aspersions on the authority of some of the later entries. The entries of the Register of the Royal Council were first drawn on by G. Chalmers in 1797, and later incorporated in the Boswell-Malone *Variorum Shakspeare* of 1821, vol. iii. They are now also available in *Acts of the Privy Council of England* (up to June, 1601), 1890–1906, edited by J. R. Dasent. *On Court Performances before Queen Elizabeth*, see an interesting paper of E. K. Chambers in *The Modern Language Review*, ii, 1906. I regret that I should not have been able to see the same author's *Notes on the History of the Revels Office under the Tudors*, 1906, before my own paragraph on the subject was in plate.

On the **organization of the boy companies** and their earlier history, besides Collier and Malone, F. G. Fleay, *Chronicle History of the London Stage*, 1559–1642, 1890, is the most important work. H. Maas gives in his dissertation (Göttingen, 1901), *Die Kindertruppen*, 1559–1642, a brief résumé of our present information. The traffic in the boy actors carried on by Nathaniel Giles and others is illustrated in documents discovered by J. Greenstreet and communicated to *The Athenæum* of August 10, 1889. These documents are epitomized by Fleay in his *History of the Stage*, as above; and a popular account of the traffic is given by F. E. Schelling in the essay, "An Aery of Children, Little Eyases," *The Queen's Progress*, 1904. The only masters of choirs and schools likewise theatrical managers, to be mentioned in *D. N. B.*, are Richard Mulcaster, William Elderton, and Nathaniel Giles; in the case of each is added some earlier bibliography on the subject. Mulcaster, for his wider interests in education, has been well treated by C. Benndorf, "Die englische Pädagogik im 16. Jahrhundert," *Wiener Beiträge*, xii, 1905. Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, i, has a note on Elderton, and see Ritson, *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, ed. 1794. As to the earlier masters of the Children of the Chapel Royal and other early boys' companies, see W. Y. Durand, "Notes on Edwards," *Jour-*

*nal of Germanic Philology*, iv, 1901–02; C. C. Stopes, "William Hunnis," *Athenæum*, March, 1900; and *Jahrbuch*, xxvii, 1892. See, also, J. Sargeaunt, *Annals of Westminster School*, 1898, and the note of E. J. L. Scott, *Athenæum*, February 14, 1903.

The manner of the **performances of early court plays** is best gleaned from the stage directions of the plays themselves, provided sophisticated modern editions be not employed. In C. Plummer's *Elizabethan Oxford* is contained a Latin account by W. Bereblock of the arrangement of a hall at Oxford for the performance of a play before the queen in 1566. This has been translated by W. Y. Durand with a sensible commentary, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xx, 1905. Much information on the question of actual staging and properties can be obtained from the *Revels* as above, and from *The Old Cheque-Book of the Chapel Royal*, edited by E. F. Rimbault for the *Camden Society*, 1872.

For **John Lyly** the latest word is contained in *The Complete Works of John Lyly*, edited with exhaustive Introduction and explanatory matter by R. W. Bond, 3 vols., 1902. See, also, Bond's earlier "John Lyly, Novelist and Dramatist," *Quarterly Review*, January, 1896; and J. D. Wilson, *Essay on John Lyly*, 1905. Bond's reprint of Lyly's works has quite superseded the earlier edition of F. W. Fairholt, *The Dramatic Works of John Lilly*, 2 vols., 1858, by no means a bad work in its day. Both include the *Sixe Court Comedies*, first collected and printed by E. Blount in 1632, and other work ascribed to Lyly. The best account of **euphuism, its origins and characteristics**, is that of C. G. Child, "John Lyly and Euphuism," *Münchener Beiträge*, vii, 1894, where an excellent bibliography up to its date will be found. The chief earlier authorities are H. Morley, "On Euphuism," *Quarterly Review*, cix, 1861; R. F. Weymouth, "On Euphuism," *Transactions of the Philological Society*, Part III, 1870–72; and F. Landmann, *Der Euphuismus*, 1881. There is a Halle dissertation by L. Wendelstein, *Zur Vorgeschichte des Euphuism*, 1901. See, also, the earlier

papers of C. C. Hense on the qualities of Lyly's style, *Jahrbuch*, vii and viii, 1872–73, and the valuable "Biographical Introduction" to G. P. Baker's ed. of *Endymion*, 1894. The earliest of the many attempts at the elucidation of Lyly's dramatic allegory was that of N. J. Halpin, *Oberon's Vision in Midsummer Night's Dream*, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1843. For later theories on the subject, see Baker's ed. of *Endymion* and Bond's *Lyly*, both mentioned above. E. Koeppel has an article, "Zu Lyly's Alexander und Campaspe," in *Archiv*, cx, 1903. "On the Authorship of the Songs of Lyly's Plays" (here ascribed to Dekker), see W. W. Greg in *Modern Language Quarterly*, i, 1905. For Lyly in his relations to Shakespeare, see the paragraphs below under title *Romantic Comedy*, section viii.

The Dramatic Works of George Peele were first collected by A. Dyce, 3 vols., 1829–39, and republished by the same editor in 1861. The latest collective edition is that of A. H. Bullen, 2 vols., 1888. For Peele's life, see R. Lämmerhirt, *George Peele, Untersuchungen über sein Leben und seine Werke*, 1882, and the article by A. W. Ward in *D. N. B.* vol. xliv, 1895. An excellent critical essay by F. B. Gummere on Peele, his place in the drama, and the significance of *The Old Wives' Tale*, will be found in Gayley. See, also, E. Penner, "Metrische Untersuchungen zu Peele," *Archiv*, lxxxv, 1890; A. R. Bayley, "Peele as a Dramatist," *Oxford Point of View*, February 15, 1903; and G. C. Odell in *Bibliographer*, ii, 1903. Peele has attracted of late the attention of the German dissertation: E. Kroneberg, Jena, and W. Thieme, Halle, writing on *Edward I;* B. Neitzel, Halle, on *David and Bethsabe*, all 1904; and M. Dannenberg, Königsberg, on the "*Verwendung*" of biblical material in this and other plays of this topic, 1905. The most recent edition of *The Arraignment of Paris* is that of O. Smeaton, *Temple Dramatists*, 1905. *The Battle of Alcazar* has been reprinted for the *Malone Society* by F. Sidgwick, 1906. Thomas Nash was edited with an Introduction by A. B. Grosart in the *Huth Library*, 5 vols., 1883–84; and

now by R. B. McKerrow, 1905–06, three volumes of the text thus far. See, also, S. Lee's article on *Nash* in *D. N. B.* xl, 1894.

## IV. THE LONDON PLAYHOUSE

The earliest specific description of the playhouses of Elizabeth's time and James', and the practices of the stage, are contained in the interesting pamphlet by James Wright, *Historia Histrionica, an Account of the English Stage*, 1699, reprinted in Hazlitt's Dodsley, vol. xv. Other older works are B. Victor, *History of the Theatre*, 1761; and a work of the same title by C. W. Oulton, 1796 and 1817. In the third volume of Malone's *Variorum Shakspeare*, 1821, will be found a collection of the antiquarian and historical learning on this subject by various hands up to that time. This was considerably added to by Collier, who devoted the second part of his *History of English Dramatic Literature*, 1831 (new ed. in 1879), to the *Annals of the Stage up to the Restoration;* though here, as elsewhere, Collier's deductions and even his printed evidences must be followed by the wary with circumspection. A saner use is made of old material by N. Drake in his excellent book, *Shakspeare and his Times*, 1817; and by Halliwell-Phillipps in the successive growths of his *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare* (from a slender volume in 1881 to two portentous tomes in the 9th ed. 1892) adding much material to our knowledge of Shakespeare's traffic with the stage. In 1890 F. G. Fleay published his *Chronicle History of the London Stage*, 1559–1642, and it remains, however discredited in some particulars, the best compendium of the history of the London companies. A popular work of more extended reach is H. B. Baker, *History of the London Stage and its Famous Players*, 1904. Materials for the biographies of the more important actors of old time were gathered by J. P. Collier in his *Memoirs of the Principal Actors in the Plays of Shakespeare, Old Sh. Soc. Publ.*

1846. See, also, his *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn*, for the same, 1841. Alleyn's life and that of Richard Burbage are contributed to the *D. N. B.* by S. Lee, the editor; the lives of Tarlton, Kemp, Hemming, Condell, and other actors of the day will likewise be found therein. See, also, an older paper of H. Kurz on "Shakespeare der Schauspieler," *Jahrbuch*, vi, 1871.

For the **London of Elizabeth and King James** the point of departure must always be John Stow's monumental *Survey of London*, first published in 1598, enlarged by A. Munday and H. Dyson in 1633; edited in a fifth edition by J. Strype in 1724, and often since. Stow is accessible in many modern editions, among them that of Henry Morley in the *Carisbrooke Library*, 1893. Amongst the many volumes that deal with London more at large may be mentioned P. Cunningham's *Handbook of London*, 2 vols., 1849; enlarged and rewritten by H. B. Wheatley under title *London Past and Present*, 3 vols., 1891. *London*, by Walter, later Sir Walter, Besant, 1892, contains a vivid historical account of the metropolis from the earliest times, and was the earnest of much material gathered by the late novelist on this theme. Cf. the volumes on Westminster, East and South London, and the four volumes, "London, Mediæval," "In the Times of the Tudors," "The Stuarts," and "In the Eighteenth Century," 1906. A scholarly smaller work, more closely connected with the subject of these volumes, is *Shakespeare's London, a Study of London in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, by T. F. Ordish, 1897. An excellent recent book of the same general title is that of H. T. Stephenson, 1905. G. W. Thornbury, *Shakespeare's England*, 1856, and Mrs. F. S. Boas, *In Shakspere's England*, 1904, are popular books of wider scope. Certain interesting side lights on old London, and on the theaters as well may be found in the excellent old work by W. B. Rye, *England as Seen by Foreigners*, 1865. Later additions to this are G. Binz, "Londoner Theater und Schauspiele im Jahre 1599," *Anglia*, xxii, 456; and the notable dis-

covery of Gaedertz, 1888, mentioned in the next paragraph.

For the **London theaters** specifically, T. F. Ordish, *Early London Theatres* (In the Fields), 1894, should be consulted. His promised companion volume on the theaters of the city has not appeared. The discovery, by K. T. Gaedertz, in 1888, of the copy of an ancient pen drawing of the Swan Theater in 1598, and his publication of the sketch and the accompanying description of it by its author, one Johannes de Witt, in 1888, under title *Zur Kenntnis der altenglischen Bühne*, has led to much discussion, more especially of late. This matter and those which led out of it may be followed by reference to H. B. Wheatley, "On a Contemporary Drawing of the Swan Theatre," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1887–92; R. Genée, "Ueber die scenischen Formen Shakespeare's in ihrem Verhältniss zur Bühne seiner Zeit," *Jahrbuch*, xxvi, 1891; H. Logemann, in *Anglia*, xix, 1896; W. J. Laurence, "Some Characteristics of the Elizabeth-Stuart Stage," *Engl. Stud.* xxxii, 1903; E. E. Hale, Jr., "The Influence of Theatrical Conditions on Shakespeare," *Mod. Phil.* i, 1903; C. Brodmeier, *Die Shakespeare Bühne nach den alten Bühnenanweisungen*, 1904; A. Brandl, "Eine neue Art Shakespeare zu spielen," *Deutsche Rundschau*, April, 1905; and, above all, the sane paper of G. F. Reynolds, "Some Principles of Elizabethan Staging," *Mod. Phil.* ii and iii, 1904–05; together with the numerous citations of earlier authorities which these works contain. See, also, a popular résumé of the subject, "Elizabethan Stage Theories," *The Times*, November 3, 1905. It cannot be said that the article of Mrs. C. C. Stopes, "Elizabethan Stage Scenery," *Fortnightly Review*, June, 1907, adds much to the subject, save for a contemporary allusion or two. On the larger topic of the origin of modern scenery, see E. Flechsig, *Die Dekoration der modernen Bühne in Italien . . . bis zum Schluss des XVI Jahrhunderts*, 1894; G. Ferrari, *La Scenografia*, 1902, and the discussion of the transition from

medieval to modern stage-setting by Rigal, Lanson, and Haraszti in *La Revue d'Histoire litteraire de la France*, 1904–05.

Many **documents, acts, regulations, and proclamations appertaining to the history of the stage** have been collected by W. C. Hazlitt, *The English Drama and Stage, illustrated by a Series of Documents, Treaties, and Poems*, 1869; and by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps in *A Collection of Ancient Documents respecting the Office of the Master of the Revels and other papers relating to early English theaters*, 1890. Cunningham's *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court in the Reigns of Elizabeth and King James I, Old Sh. Soc.* 1842, though partially discredited, is a valuable source for much of the earlier material of the drama at court. A new edition of these records, by Mrs. C. C. Stopes, is now promised, and some of its entries can be taxed and verified by the reference to J. R. Dasent, *Acts of the Privy Council of England*, 1890–95. (For the relation of these entries, see W. W. Greg in *The Modern Language Review*, ii, 1906.) Collier's edition of *The Diary of Philip Henslowe*, for the *Old Sh. Soc.* 1845, his *Memoirs of Edward Alleyn* and *Alleyn Papers*, a further collection of documents, for the same society, 1841 and 1843, afford similar invaluable material for the popular stage. Unfortunately Collier has nowhere been so discredited as in the first of these three publications, concerning which see, especially, G. F. Warner, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts and Monuments of Alleyn's College of God's Gift at Dulwich*, 1881, and the Introduction of the edition of Henslowe, mentioned next. Happily this matter is now to be set at rest, so far as Henslowe is concerned, by an accurate reprint of his *Diary* by W. W. Greg, one volume of which has already appeared, 1905, another containing the commentary being promised for the near future.

As to the **wandering of the London companies in the provinces**, Halliwell-Phillipp's *Visits of Shakespeare's Company of Actors to Provincial Cities and Towns of*

*England*, 1887, may be consulted. A first installment of a wider study of *English Dramatic Companies in the Towns outside of London*, 1550–1600, by J. T. Murray, has appeared of late (1905) in *Mod. Phil.* ii. For the wanderings of English actors beyond the confines of England, see A. Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, 1865; J. Tittmann, "Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland," *Deutsche Dichter des 16ten Jahrhunderts*, xiii, 1880; J. Meissner, *Die englischen Comödianten zur Zeit Shakespeares in Oesterreich*, 1884; W. Creizenach, *Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten*, 1889; and especially the excellent monograph of E. Herz, *Englische Schauspieler und englisches Schauspiel zur Zeit Shakespeare's in Deutschland*, 1903; and the incidental bibliographies. Interesting contemporary comment on the English companies in Germany is that of Fynes Moryson in his *Itinerary*, published under title *Shakespeare's Europe*, by C. Hughes, 1903; J. Stefanson treats in *Contemporary Review*, January, 1896, of "Shakespeare at Elsinore;" Jusserand, in the same, April, 1898, of "English Actors in France;" A. Cargill, of "Shakespeare in Scotland," *Chambers' Journal*, December, 1904. The controversy concerning the good or evil of the stage, especially that part of it which arrayed the city as the attacking party against the court as the defenders of the drama, is best summarized by E. N. S. Thompson, "The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage," *Yale Studies in English*, xx, 1903. H. C. Symmes, *Les Débat de la Critique Dramatique en Angleterre jusqu'â la Mort de Shakespeare*, 1903, admirably covers earlier and wider ground. For the minor bibliography of this controversy, the reader is referred to these works. Several of the treatises, such as those of Northbrook, Gosson, and Lodge, were reprinted for the Old Shakespeare Society.

## V. THE NEW ROMANTIC DRAMA

On the **earlier romantic influences** at work on the drama, see O. Ballman, "Chaucer's Einfluss auf das englische Drama," *Anglia*, xxv, 1901; L. L. Schücking, *Studien über die stofflichen Beziehungen der englischen Komoedie zur italienischen bis Lilly*, 1901, discredited at least as to Lyly by Bond in his new edition of that dramatist, 1902; and J. W. Cunliffe, "The Influence of Italian on early Elizabethan Drama," *Mod. Phil.* iv, 1907. J. R. Murray, *The Influence of Italian upon English Literature during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, 1886, is a work of wider reach. Among the heroical plays, *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes* has been much discussed. See, especially, L. Kellner in *Engl. Stud.* xiii, 1890; R. Fischer in the next volume; and G. L. Kittredge in *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iii, 1901, where it is definitely assigned to Preston. *Charlemagne*, reprinted by Bullen (*Old English Plays*, vol. iii, 1884) as *The Distracted Emperor*, is surmised Dekker's by Fleay. The source of "*The Thracian Wonder* in Greene's *Menaphon*" is discussed all but simultaneously by J. Q. Adams, Jr., in *Mod. Phil.* iii, January, 1906, and by J. LeG. Brereton in *Engl. Stud.* xxxvii, 1907. Brandl, *Quellen des weltlichen Dramas*, 1898, discusses *Common Conditions* and *Gismond of Salern*. There is likewise a Breslau Dissertation by C. Sherwood, 1892, on the latter play; and it has been edited by I. Gollancz in the *Tudor Library*, 1893. Cunliffe, in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xxi, 1906, makes clear the relations of *Gismond* to Dolce's *Didone;* on the wider relations of the theme, see Klein, vol. v, and Ward, vol. i. Peele's *Old Wives' Tale* was first assigned in its relation to this group by Gummere in Gayley. For *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* and its inspiration, besides the general authorities on Beaumont and Fletcher below, see, especially, J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly in Introduction to Shelton's *Don Quixote*, 1613, *Tudor Translations*, i, 1896; and E. Koeppel, "Don Quixote, Sancho Panza, und Dulcinea in

der englishen Litteratur," a study of wider scope, *Archiv*, ci, 1898. *The Knight* was edited by B. Leonhardt in 1885. (See, also, the same and M. Koch in *Engl. Stud.* ix and xii, 1886–89.) The play has been edited more recently by F. W. Moorman in the *Temple Dramatists*, 1898; a critical ed. is now (1907) in press by H. S. Murch, *Yale Studies;* and another is promised by R. M. Alden in *Belles Lettres Series*.

Besides the general histories of the drama and the works already mentioned as concerned (such as Symonds and Boas) specifically with the predecessors of Shakespeare, the earlier romantic dramatists have most of them received separate treatment. The best account of **George Whetstone** is that of S. Lee in *D. N. B.;* older mention of Whetstone is that of Collier in his *Critical Account of the Rarest Books, s. v.*, Park in *Heliconia*, ii, and Corser, *Collectanea Anglo-Poetica*, xi, 382. For Peele and Nash see the preceding section of this essay. The authoritative and only collective edition of The Works of **Thomas Kyd** is that of F. S. Boas, 1901; the last section of the Introduction contains an excellent bibliography. Aside from the earlier appreciations of Collier, Kreyssig in his *Vorlesungen über Shakespeare*, 1874, and Ward, 1875, Markscheffel (in his two dissertations on the tragedies of Kyd, in the *Jahresbericht des Realgymnasiums zu Weimar*, 1886 and 1887), offered the earliest serious attempt to rehabilitate Kyd; and he was followed by G. Sarrazin in his *Thomas Kyd und sein Kreis*, 1892, the conclusion of a series of admirable studies on Kyd in *Anglia*, xii-xiv and in *Engl. Stud.* xv. The results of this and later work by Koeppel (in *Engl. Stud.*) and Brandl (in *Göttingische gelehrter Anzeiger*, 1891) are gathered by S. Lee in *D. N. B.* xxxi, 1892. Kyd was further treated, with others, in his relations especially to Seneca, by R. Fischer, *Zur Kunstentwickelung der englischen Tragödie*, 1893. G. O. Fleischer, in *Bemerkung über Kyds Spanish Tragedy*, 1896, collated the quartos of that play. Admirable contributions to the text and under-

standing of Kyd are those of J. Schick in the introductions to his editions of *The Spanish Tragedy*, in the *Temple Dramatists*, 1898, in the *Archiv*, xc; in *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, xix, 1901; and elsewhere. J. A. Worp, in *Jahrbuch*, xxix and xxx, 1894, discusses *Die Fabel der Spanish Tragedy*, especially in a later Dutch borrowing, and R. Schönwerth in the same, xxxvi, 1903, determines the relations of the German and Dutch plays on the same topic. The moot questions of **Kyd's relations to the earlier Hamlet**, and to the German version of the Hamlet story, *Der bestrafte Brudermord*, are considered by Furness in his *Variorum Hamlet*, 1877, vol. ii; and summarized by Boas, who refers to the two Dissertations on Hamlet by R. G. Latham, 1872; to W. H. Widgery's *Harness Prize Essay*, 1880; and to G. Tanger, "Der bestrafte Brudermord und sein Verhältniss zu Shakespeare's *Hamlet*," *Jahrbuch*, xxiii, 1888. G. Sarrazin had treated this topic in *Anglia*, xii and xiii, 1890–91 also; J. Corbin, in "The German *Hamlet* and Earlier English Versions," *Harvard Studies*, v, 1896; J. Schick, "Die Entstehung des Hamlets," *Jahrbuch*, xxxviii, 1902; and M. B. Evans, *Der bestrafte Brudermord, sein Verhältnis zu Shakespeare's Hamlet*, 1902. K. Meier, in *Dresdner Anzeiger*, March, 1904, denies that the "Ur-hamlet" was Kyd's. A reconsideration of the latter problem by W. Creizenach will be found in *Mod. Phil.* ii, 1905; further treated by the same author, in "Die vorshakespeare'sche Hamlettragödie," *Jahrbuch*, xlii, 1906. For unnecessary "historic doubts" as to Kyd's relations to the "*Ur-Hamlet*," see A. S. Jack in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xx, 1905; for the necessary quietus, J. W. Cunliffe in the next volume of the same, 1906, under title, *Nash and the Earlier Hamlet*. Among many other contributions on the subject of **Kyd and his dramas**, Koeppel discusses the sources of *Soliman and Perseda* in *Engl. Stud.* xvi, 1892; E. Sieper, this story in modern literature, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, n. f., x, 1897; and J. E. Routh rejects Kyd's authorship of *Ieronimo* in a comparison of the rime

schemes of this play with those of *Soliman*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 1905. H. Gassner reprinted *Cornelia*, 1894. O. Michael, *Der Stil in Thomas Kyd's Originaldramen*, Berlin Dissertation, 1905, I have not seen. F. G. Hubbard, "Repetition and Parallelism in the Earlier Elizabethan Drama," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xx, 1905, especially concerns Kyd. A *Concordance of the Works of Kyd* by C. Crawford has recently appeared in *Materialien zur Kunde*, xv, 1906. J. LeG. Brereton contributes notes to the text of Kyd in *Engl. Stud.* xxxvii, 1907. For the alleged relation of Kyd to the Parnassus plays, see below, section xiv.

On the moot questions which relate to the **Shakespearean and other plays on Titus**, see the résumé of Ward, vol. ii, the preface of A. Symons to the facsimile of the quarto of 1600, 1885, and the definitive papers of H. De W. Fuller and G. P. Baker in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xvi, 1901. A chorus of critics from Theobald, Malone, and Coleridge to Fleay and Grosart have questioned Shakespeare's authorship of *Titus Andronicus*. H. Kurz, "Zu *Titus Andronicus*," *Jahrbuch*, v, 1870, A. C. Swinburne in his *Study of Shakespeare*, 1880, A. Schröer, *Ueber Titus Andronicus*, 1881, and D. H. Madden, *The Diary of Master William Silence*, 1897, have defended the great dramatist's claim. F. G. Fleay (*Chronicle*, ii, 64, 299) inclines to ascribe *Titus* to Marlowe; A. B. Grosart, *Engl. Stud.* xxii, 1896, asks "Was Robert Greene substantially the Author of *Titus Andronicus?*" S. Lee, *Shakespeare*, returns to Malone's ascription of *Titus* to Kyd. The latest word on the topic is that of J. M. Robertson, "Did Shakespeare write *Titus Andronicus?*" *Modern Language Review*, i, 1905; and see, also, W. W. Greg in the next number of the same. An account of the recently discovered quarto of *Titus*, 1594, is given by D. C. Tovey in *Notes and Queries*, series x, iii, 1905. Schreckhas writes *Ueber Entstehungszeit und Verfasser des Titus*, Rostock Diss. 1906.

Among the many editions of **Christopher Marlowe**, from that of E. G. Robinson, 1826, to F. Cunningham's, 1871,

and the Mermaid edition by H. Ellis, 1887, the most important are those of A. Dyce, 3 vols., 1850 (new eds., 1865 and 1876); of A. H. Bullen, 3 vols., 1884–85; and the *Historische-Kritische Ausgabe*, by H. Breymann and A. Wagner, 1885–89. Other eds. are those of Bell, n. d., and of P. E. Pinkerton, 1885. Besides the critical treatment accorded Marlowe in every history of literature and of the drama, the reader should consult the various memoirs prefixed to the editions of **Marlowe's works** just mentioned; the article of A. C. Swinburne in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, ninth ed. 1883; and S. Lee in *D. N. B.* xxxvi, 1890. Many essays in periodical literature on Marlowe are worthy of attention; see, especially, the five papers in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, 1840–41; the discussion of individual plays in *Blackwood's Magazine*, vols. i and ii, 1816–17; and W. L. Courtney in *The Fortnightly Review*, September, 1905. E. Faligan, *De Marlovianis Fabulis*, 1887, is described as "a thesis exposing some of the fables concerning Marlowe." The most recent contribution to the biography of Marlowe is J. H. Ingram's *Marlowe and his Associates*, 1904. This work includes a bibliography of value. For the **relations of Marlowe to Shakespeare**, see the earlier discussions of Tycho-Mommsen, 1854, under that title; of F. M. von Bodenstedt, *Marlowe und Greene als Vorläufer Shakespeare's*, 1858; and H. Ulrici, "Christopher Marlowe und Shakespeare's Verhältniss zu ihm," *Jahrbuch*, i, 1865. In 1876 Jane Lee contributed a suggestive paper on this topic to the New Shakspere Society; and A. W. Verity made this the subject of his *Harness Prize Essay*, 1886; Mommsen discussing the matter anew in his *Marlowe und Shakespeare* of the same year. A recent contribution to the topic is that of H. Jung, *Das Verhältniss Marlowes zu Shakespeare*, 1904. For Marlowe's relations to the earlier chronicle plays and as to his *Edward II*, see below. An elaborate study of **Marlowe's diction** is O. Fischer's dissertation, *Zur Characteristik der Dramen Marlowe's*, 1889. C. Schau, Leipzig Diss. 1904, discusses

Marlowe's language and grammar. An early thesis of J. Schipper is *De Versu Marlowii*, 1867, which may well have been the starting-point of the later admirable labors of this notable authority on English versification, whose excellent *Englische Metrik*, 1888, should be consulted on the whole subject. Two investigations into this subject prior to Marlowe are A. Schröer, "Anfänge des Blank verses in England," *Anglia*, iv, 1881, and M. Wagner, *The English Dramatic Blank Verse before Marlowe*, 1882. **The blank verse of Marlowe** forms part of every text-book on English verse and of every discussion of his services to English poetry and drama. A. Marquardsen in *Jahrbuch*, xli, 1905, discusses Marlowe's "*Kosmologie*" with a wider outlook than the title implies. Specific treatment of **individual plays of Marlowe** are C. H. Herford, "The Sources of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*," *Academy*, October 20, 1883; L. Fränkel, "Zum Stoffe von Marlowe's *Tamburlaine*," *Engl. Stud.* xvi, 1892. E. Hübener, *Der Einfluss von Marlowe's Tamburlaine auf die zeitgenossischen und folgenden Dramatiker*, 1901. T. Delius, *Marlowe's Faustus und seine Quelle*, 1881 (but see the fuller discussion in A. W. Ward, ed. of *Faustus*, as below); L. Kellner, "Die Quelle von Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*," *Engl. Stud.* x, 1887; and J. Friedrich, *Didodramen des Dolce, Jodelle, und Marlowe*, 1888. See, too, especially the prefatory matter to single editions of the plays, notably those of Breymann and Wagner. The fullest compendious treatment in English of *Faustus* in its various interesting relations is that of A. W. Ward in his ed. of that play, first published (with Greene's *Friar Bacon*) in 1878, third ed. 1892. Therein is hived the learning of the Germans on the topic, and to it and to its full and valuable notes the reader must be referred for specific information. None the less the following works may be mentioned for guidance: K. Engel, *Zusammenstellung der Faustschriften des 16. Jahrhunderts*, 1844, new ed. 1884; E. Schmidt, "Marlowe's *Faust* und sein Verhältnis zu den deutschen und englischen Faustbüchern," *Jahrbuch*

*für romanische Sprache*, n. f. ii, 1875; J. H. Albers in the succeeding volume of the same; H. Düntzer and W. Wagner in *Anglia*, i and ii, 1878–79; W. Creizenach, *Versuch einer Geschichte des Volksschauspiels von Doctor Faustus*, 1878; C. Grant, "The Two Fausts," *Contemporary Review*, 1881; E. Schmidt, "Zur Vorgeschichte des Goetheschen *Faust*," *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, iv, 1883; W. Heineman, "An Essay towards a Bibliography of *Faustus*," reprinted from *The Bibliographer*, 1884; F. Zarncke, "Das englische Volksbuch vom Doctor Faustus," *Anglia*, ix, 1886; H. S. Edwards, *The Faust Legend*, 1886. The Faustus Cycle in its larger relations forms a valuable chapter in Herford's *Literary Relations of England and Germany*, already mentioned. P. Machule, in *Archiv*, lxxxvi, 1891, and W. Bang in *Jahrbuch*, xxxix, 1903, add emendation to the much emended text of Marlowe's tragedy. A later bibliographical guide is *The Catalogue of the Faust Exhibition in Frankfort*, 1893. Among the several separate eds. of *Faustus* may be mentioned that of I. Gollancz, *Temple Dramatists*, 1905.

With the exception of his translations, *The Works of* **Thomas Lodge** have been collected by E. Gosse for the Hunterian Club, 1878–82, with an Introduction since published in his *Seventeenth Century Studies*, 1883. D. Laing, "Introduction to Lodge's Defence of Poetry, Music, and Stage Plays," *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1853, and S. Lee's article in *D. N. B.* xxxiv, 1893, should also be consulted. See, also, R. Carl, "Ueber Thomas Lodge's Leben und Werke," *Anglia*, x, and separately published, 1887; and a Leipzig dissertation of the same year and title by E. C. Richard. M. E. N. Fraser, *Thomas Lodge as a Dramatist*, unpublished thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1898, is an attempt to determine the doubtful limits of Lodge's converse with the stage. On the question, *Was Thomas Lodge an Actor*, see C. M. Ingleby's article of that title, 1868; his "General Introduction to Shakspere Allusion-Books," Part I, *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874; and "Thomas Lodge and the Stage,"

*Notes and Queries*, sixth series, xi, 1885. For Lodge as a source for Shakespeare, see N. Delius, "Lodge's *Rosalynde* und *As You Like It*," *Jahrbuch*, vi, 1871; and W. G. Stone in *New Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1884. The questions arising out of *Mucedorus* are well discussed in K. Warnke and L. Proescholdt's ed. of that comedy, 1878. See, also, R. Simpson, in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874, the contributions of W. Wagner and C. Elze in *Jahrbuch*, xi to xv, 1876–80; and R. Sach, *Die Shakespeare zugeschriebenen zweifelhaften Stücke*, *ibid.* xxvii, 1892. W. W. Greg treats definitively the bibliography of the many quartos of the *Mucedorus*, *ibid.* xl, 1904.

*The Dramatic Works of* **Robert Greene** were first collected by A. Dyce in 2 vols., 1831, and later published with those of Peele in 1861. *The Complete Works of Greene* by A. B. Grosart, in 15 vols., appeared in 1881–86, and *The Plays and Poems of Robert Greene*, edited by J. C. Collins, 2 vols., 1905. Accounts of Greene will be found prefixed to each of these editions of his works, the translation of N. Storojenko (in Grosart's *Greene*) being the most complete. Other articles are those of W. Bernhardi, *Robert Greene's Leben und Schriften*, 1874; J. M. Brown, *An Early Rival of Shakspere*, Auckland, 1877; R. Simpson, "Account of Robert Greene, his Prose Works, and his Quarrel with Shakspere," in vol. ii of *The School of Shakspere*, 1878; C. H. Herford, "On Greene's Romances and Shakspere," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1888; A. H. Bullen's article in *D. N. B.* xxiii, 1890; K. Knauth, *Ueber die Metrik Greene's*, Diss. 1890; H. Conrad, "Robert Greene als Dramatiker," *Jahrbuch*, xxix, 1894; and the two essays by G. E. Woodberry and C. M. Gayley in the latter's *Representative English Comedies*, 1903. K. Ehrke, *Robert Greene's Dramen*, 1904; and a suggestive paper by S. L. Wolff, "Robert Greene and the Italian Renaissance," in *Engl. Stud.* xxxvii, 1907, are later contributions to the subject. On *Pandosto* and *Winter's Tale*, see N. Delius in *Jahrbuch*, xv, 1880; on *James IV*, W. Creizenach in *Anglia*, viii,

1885; on *George a Greene*, O. Mertius, dissertation, 1885; on *Friar Bacon*, A. W. Ward, *Faustus*, new ed. 1892; on the ascription of *Selimus* to Greene, see A. B. Grosart's ed. of that tragedy in *Temple Dramatists*, 1898; and G. Hugo, *Robert Greene's Selimus*, Kiel Diss. 1899. A reprint of *Orlando Furioso*, quarto of 1594, edited by R. B. MacKerrow, 1907, is one of the recent volumes of the new *Malone Society*. The notorious *Groatsworth of Wit*, 1592, has been repeatedly reprinted and is most conveniently consulted in "Shakspere Allusion-Books," Part I, *New Sh. Soc.* 1874, edited by C. M. Ingleby, or in G. Saintsbury's *Elizabethan and Jacobean Pamphlets*, 1902.

## VI. THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL DRAMA

Aside from such incidental treatment as the subject receives from more general histories, for **Elizabethan plays based on the history of England** the reader is referred to F. E. Schelling, *The English Chronicle Play, a Study in the Popular Historical Literature environing Shakespeare*, 1902, to which a list of plays on English historical subjects is appended. As to the Robin Hood plays, see Chambers, *The Mediæval Drama*, where the bibliography of the subject is given, and F. J. Child, *The English and Scottish Popular Ballads*, 1882–98, vol. v, where the extant remnants of these plays are reprinted. Chambers also treats of the St. George's or Mummers' play and appends lists of their occurrence. Examples of the St. George's play will be found with other forerunners of the popular historical drama in J. M. Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shakespearean Drama*, vol. i. See, also, A. Beatty in *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Science*, xv, 1906. T. Sharp's *Dissertations on Pageants*, 1825, contains the best account of the Hock Tuesday play, though R. Lenham's jocular description, 1576, reprinted in Nichols, *Elizabeth*, 2d ed. 1823, vol. i, should likewise be consulted. On the quasi-political moralities, *King Johan* and *Albion Knight*, see

Ward, *The English Chronicle Plays*, *s. v.*, and the Introductions to the editions of these plays by Collier for the *Camden Society*, 1838; and in the *Old Sh. Soc.'s Papers*, 1844. *The True Tragedy of Richard III* and *Richardus Tertius* were both printed for the same in 1844. W. Thieme discusses the sources of Peele's *Edward I*, Halle Diss. 1903. *Locrine*, assigned now definitely to Peele (W. S. Gaud in *Mod. Phil.* i, 1904), is referred to its sources and literary relations by T. Erbe, "Die Locrinesage und die Quellen des Pseudo-Shakespeare'schen Locrine," *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, xvi, 1904; shown to be plagiarized by the author of *Selimus*, by E. Koeppel in *Jahrbuch*, xli, 1905; and examined with other like plays as to *Repetition and Parallelism* of style by F. G. Hubbard, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xx, 1905. H. Schütt treats *The Life and Death of Jack Straw*, Kiel Diss. 1901.

Quartos of several **pre-Shakespearean chronicle plays** have been reproduced in *facsimile* or otherwise reprinted with their later revisions or derivatives. *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, the older *King John*, and the two *Contentions* will be found among the photolithographic *Shakspere-Quarto Facsimiles*, published under the superintendence of F. G. Furnivall, 43 vols., 1885–90, and among the volumes of the *Bankside Shakespeare*, 20 vols., 1888–92. The prefaces of the former by various editors are often especially valuable. The relations of *The Famous Victories* to Shakespeare's *Henry V* are discussed by W. G. Stone in the *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1880. An account of Tarlton, to whom the old play has been assigned, may be found in *Tarlton's Jests*, *ibid.* 1844. The vexed questions of **the authorship and relations of the three parts of Henry VI** to the two older plays dealing with the subject find place in every edition of Shakespeare. The chief authorities on this topic are G. White, "Essay on the Authorship of *King Henry VI*," vol. vii of his ed. of *Shakespeare*, 1859, and *Studies in Shakespeare*, 1885; G. L. Rives, *Harness Prize*, 1874; F. G. Fleay in *Macmillan's Magazine*, Novem-

ber, 1875; and J. Lee in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1875–76. See, also, the résumé of Ward (ii, 58–74), and the note prefatory to these plays in W. A. Neilson's ed. of *Shakespeare*, 1906. K. Schmidt treats of "Margareta von Anjou vor und bei Shakespeare," *Palæstra*, liv, 1906. On the relations of Marlowe's *Edward II* to these plays, see Halliwell-Phillipps, *Old Sh. Soc. Papers*, i, 1844; Fleay's ed. of Marlowe's tragedy, 1877; and Bullen's *Marlowe*. See, also, C. Tzschaschal, *Marlowe's Edward II und seine Quellen*, 1902; and M. Dahmetz, *Marlowe's Edward II und Shakespeare's Richard II, ein literarisch-historischer Vergleich*, 1904. The best consideration of the dramatic art of this play is that of E. T. McLaughlin in his ed. 1894. See, also, Verity's *Introduction* to the same play, *Temple Dramatists*, 1904. For Shakespeare's alleged part in *Edward III*, see the editions by Warnke and Proescholdt, 1886, and of G. C. Moore Smith in the *Temple Dramatists*, 1897. See, also, G. Liebau, "König Edward III und die Gräfin von Salisbury," *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, xiii, 1900. A bibliography of this play by R. Sachs will be found in *Jahrbuch*, xxvii.

This is not the place in which to air an extended bibliography of Shakespeare. One of the earliest is that of J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *A Catalogue of the Early Editions of Shakespeare's Plays and the Commentaries and Other Publications*, 1841, a work followed by several others of like nature by the same author up to 1883. Since the earlier date German scholarship has become active in this field from P. H. Sillig, *Die Shakespeare-Litteratur*, 1854, and F. Thimm, *Shakespeariana*, 1865, to M. Koch in the Supplement to his *Shakespeare's dramatische Werke*, 1886; and the excellent résumé of each year's activity in Shakespeare and kindred scholarship which forms so valuable a feature of the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*. See, also, the decennial Indices of the same publication. *Digesta Shakespeareana*, published by the *Shakespeare Society of New York*, is "a topical index of printed matter other than lit-

erary or esthetic commentary," 1885. Another older useful bibliography is that of H. R. Tedder in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, xxi, 1886. *The Catalogue of the Barton Collection*, 1888, Boston Public Library, contains an important bibliography of Shakespeare. The part of *The British Museum Catalogue of Printed Books*, 1897, devoted to Shakespeare, is a valuable classified index of his works and the commentaries which have grown out of them up to that date. See, also, W. S. Brassington, *Hand-list of Collective Editions of Shakespeare's Works*, 1898; W. J. Rolfe's valuable chapter on bibliography appended to his *Life of Shakespeare*, 1904; and the excellent chapter on this subject in S. Lee's *Life of Shakespeare*, fifth ed. 1905. A comprehensive bibliography of Shakespeare (over 20,000 references and the result of many years' labor) is announced by W. Jaggard of Liverpool.

Among the innumerable **biographies of Shakespeare** which the scholarship of every civilized country of the world has produced, but a few can be here mentioned. Important is the work of J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, beginning with his *Life*, 1848, enlarged in 1853, his *Illustrations*, 1874, and extending to his *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, repeatedly enlarged from 1881 to 1887. Other valuable biographies are those of F. J. Furnivall, Introduction to the *Leopold Shakspere*, 1877 and 1886; of F. G. Fleay, 1886; E. Dowden, 1893; A. Brandl, 1894; G. M. C. Brandes, 1896; and S. Lee, enlarged from his article in *D. N. B.* in 1898 and now in a fifth edition, 1906; W. J. Rolfe, 1904, and W. Raleigh, 1907. Works of a more **critical and historical** nature are the well-known lectures of Schlegel, *Dramatische Vorlesungen*, 1846; H. N. Hudson, *Lectures on Shakespeare*, 2 vols., 1848; S. T. Coleridge, *Lectures on Shakespeare*, 1849; G. C. Gervinus, *Commentaries*, 1849–50, transl. 1863; F. A. T. Kreyssig, *Vorlesungen über Shakespeare*, 1858, and *Shakespeare Fragen*, 1871; H. Ulrici, *Shakespeares dramatische Kunst*, 3d ed. 1868–69, transl. 1876; E. Dowden, *Shakspere, his Mind and*

*Art*, 1876; A. C. Swinburne, *A Study of Shakespeare*, 1880; R. G. Moulton, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, 1885; H. Corson, *Introduction to the Study of Shakespeare*, 1889; B. Ten Brink, *Fünf Shakespeare-Vorlesungen*, 1892; B. Wendell, *William Shakspere, a Study in Elizabethan Literature*, 1894; G. Sarrazin, *Shakespeare's Lehrjahre*, 1897; T. R. Lounsbury, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, 1901; S. Lanier, *Shakspere and his Forerunners*, 1902; T. Seccombe and J. W. Allen, *The Age of Shakespeare*, 2 vols., the second on the drama, 1903. A convenient little volume is that of D. H. Lambert, *Shakespeare Documents, a Chronological Catalogue of the Extant Evidence relating to the Life and Works of Shakespeare*, 1904. See, also, R. Genée, *William Shakespeare in seinem Werden und Wesen*, 1905; and F. W. Moorman, *An Introduction to Shakespeare*, 1906.

A few **other works on Shakespeare**, for which there does not appear to be other place, are K. Simrock, *Quellen des Shakespeares*, 1831, translated for the *Old Sh. Soc.* by Halliwell-Phillipps, 1850; R. G. White, *Shakespeare's Scholar*, 1854; Hazlitt's ed. of Collier's *Shakespeare's Library*, 7 vols., 2d ed. 1875; and the recent excellent work of H. R. D. Anders, *Shakespeare's Books and the Immediate Sources of his Works*, 1904. On the **order of the plays**, see H. R. Stokes, *The Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays*, 2d ed. 1870; and J. W. Hales, *The Succession of Shakespeare's Plays*, 1874. Two older works on the **Text of Shakespeare in general** are G. L. Craik, "The Text of Shakespeare," *North British Review*, xxi, 1854; and W. S. Walker, *Critical Examination of the Text of Shakespeare*, 1860. An ambitious modern work is that of B. A. P. Van Dam and C. Stoffel, *William Shakespeare, Prosody and Text*, 1901. On the **grammar and language of Shakespeare**, among many books, see, especially, G. L. Craik, *The English of Shakespeare*, 1865; the excellent *Shakespearian Grammar* of E. A. Abbott, 1869, new ed. 1893; W. Franz, *Shakespeare-Grammatik*, 2 vols., 1898–1900; and the invaluable **Shakespeare Lexi-**

con of A. Schmidt, first published in 1874, new ed. revised by G. Sarrazin, 2 vols., 1902. The dramatic blank verse of Shakespeare, inseparably connected as it is with the history of early modern English meters, forms part of the theme of all larger treatises on English verse. W. S. Walker, *Shakespeare's Versification*, 1854, and C. Bathurst, *Difference in Shakespeare's Versification*, 1857, were the first to call attention to the differences in the verse of Shakespeare at various periods of his career. Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar* devotes an important section to Shakespeare's verse. F. G. Fleay, "On Metrical Tests as applied to Dramatic Poetry," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874, with J. Spedding, J. K. Ingram, and others in the following volumes of the same, extended the inquiry to other authors and to minuter characteristics of dramatic blank verse. See, also, W. Herzberg, "Metrisches, Grammatisches, Chronologisches zu Shakespeares Dramen," *Jahrbuch*, xiii, 1878; A. Schröer, "Die Anfänge des Blankverses in England," *Anglia*, iv, 1881; M. Wagner, *English Dramatic Blank Verse before Marlowe*, 1881; and the portions of such works as F. B. Gummere's convenient *Handbook of Poetics*, 1885, and J. B. Mayor's *Chapters on English Metre*, 1886, which are devoted to blank verse. The authoritative work on modern English meters in general is that of J. Schipper in his *Englische Metrik*, Part II, 1888, and in his "Grundriss der Englischen Metrik," *Wiener Beiträge*, 1895. See, also, the work of Van Dam and Stoffel mentioned above. A few recent miscellaneous books are J. Bartlett, *Concordance to Shakespeare*, 1895 (quite superseding the older work of C. C. and M. C. Clarke, 1867); E. J. Dunning, *Genesis of Shakespeare's Art*, 1897; W. H. Fleming, *Shakespeare's Plots*, 1902; R. Koppel, "Die unkritische Behandlung dramatischer Ausgaben," *Engl. Stud.* xxxiv, 1904; C. W. Wallace, "New Shakespeare Documents," *ibid.* xxxvi, 1906; and E. Lathrop, *Where Shakespeare set his Scene*, 1907. *The Development of Shakespeare as a Dramatist*, by G. P. Baker, 1907, has just appeared.

For the most recent bibliographical account of the **Shakespeare First Folio**, 1623, see S. Lee, preface to his reproduction of that foundation stone of Shakespearean text, 1902, and the chapter on "Bibliography" in the last edition (1905) of his Life of Shakespeare. See, also, W. W. Greg, "The Bibliographical History of the First Folio," *The Library*, second series, iv, July, 1903. The second, third, and fourth folios (1632, 1664, and 1685) have since been similarly reproduced by Methuen and Company, 1903–06. An inexact reprint of the first folio was made in 1807–08 by E. and J. Wright; an excellent type-reprint by L. Booth, 1861–64. The earliest photographic facsimile is that of Staunton, 1864–65; followed by that of Halliwell-Phillipps, 1876; and the *Dallastype Shakespeare*, 1893. Aside from the reprints of individual quartos of Shakespeare in the Old Shakespeare Society, and the New, a complete set of 43 quartos has been reproduced by photolithography, under the superintendence of F. J. Furnivall, 1880–89. For an account of the critical editions of Shakespeare and the host of comment, the reader is referred to the various bibliographies mentioned in the last paragraph. The most complete edition for the scholar is that of H. H. Furness, *A New Variorum Shakespeare*, 15 vols., 1871 to date, and still in progress. The last volume is *Antony and Cleopatra*, 1907.

**The pseudo-Shakespearean plays**, though of many varieties, are best treated here. These are the more important eds. of them: *A Supplement to the Plays of William Shakespeare*, ed. W. S. Simons, N. Y., 1848; *The Supplementary Works of William Shakespeare*, ed. W. Hazlitt, 1852; *Pseudo-Shakspere'sche Dramen*, N. Delius, 1854–56; *Doubtful Plays of Shakespeare*, M. Moltke, 1869; *The Doubtful Plays of William Shakespeare*, W. Hazlitt, 1887; *Shakespeare's Doubtful Plays*, A. F. Hopkinson, privately printed, 1890–95. An excellent résumé of pseudo-Shakespeare is that of R. Sachs, "Die Shakespeare zugeschriebenen zweifelhaften Stücke," *Jahrbuch*, xxvii, 1892.

Aside from their treatment in works of more extended character, for the **historical plays of Shakespeare** see T. P. Courtnay, *Commentaries on the Historical Plays of Shakespeare*, 2 vols., 1840; T. MacKnight, Prize Essay on the *Historical Plays of Shakespeare*, 1850; N. J. Merriman, *Shakespeare as Bearing on English History*, 1858; V. Knaur, *Die Könige Shakespeares*, 1863; A. Myer, *Shakespeare's Verletzung der historischen Wahrheit*, 1863; R. Simpson, "Politics in Shakspere's Historical Plays," *New Shakspere Society*, i, 1873; A. S. G. Canning, *Thoughts on Shakespeare's Historical Plays*, 1881; B. E. Warner, *English History in Shakespeare's Plays*, 1894; E. W. Sievers, *Shakespeare's zweiter mittelalterlicher Dramen Cyclus*, 1896; the admirable comparison of Shakespeare with his historical sources by W. G. Boswell-Stone, *Shakspere's Holinshed*, 1896; C. S. Terry, *Shakespeare the Historian*, 1899; J. L. Etty, "Studies in Shakespeare's History," *Macmillan's Magazine*, 1900–04; S. Davey, "The Relation of Poetry to History, with special reference to Shakespeare's Historical Plays," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, xxiv, 1903; and J. C. Collins, "Shakespeare and Holinshed," in *Studies in Shakespeare*, 1904. A recent Harvard Thesis is that of W. D. Briggs, *The Chronicle History, a Study in Dramatic Development*, 1906. Later German work on the general topic is that of C. W. Stern, *Historische Uebersicht der Shakespeare'schen Königsdramen*, 1903; W. Buettner, *Shakespeare's Stellung zum Hause Lancaster*, 1904; H. v. Hofmannsthal, *Shakespeare's Könige und grosse Herren*, 1905. A convenient text of the historical plays is that of C. H. Wordsworth, 1883. On **individual chronicle plays of Shakespeare**, see Stümcke, *Studien zu Shakespeares King John*, 1889; G. Kopplow, *Shakespeares King John und seine Quelle*, 1900; E. W. Sievers, "Shakespeare und der Gang nach Canossa," *Engl. Stud.* xx, 1895. W. Keller discusses, in the prefatory matter to his reprint of an older play on Richard II, *Jahrbuch*, xxxv, 1899, its remote relations to Shakespeare's *Richard II;*

F. I. Carpenter contributes notes on this play to the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iii, 1901; M. S. Nesbitt, *Notes and Queries*, series x, vol. iv, 1905, finds points of contact between this play and *The Spanish Tragedy*. For the controversy on the relations of the quarto and folio editions of *Richard III*, see the papers of J. H. Spedding, F. D. Matthew, E. H. Pickersgill, and S. Brooke in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1875–86, and A. Schmidt in *Jahrbuch*, xv, 1880. On other topics, see K. Fischer, *Shakespeares Characterentwickelung Richard III*, 1868; and H. Mueller, *Grundlage und Entwickelung des Characters Richard III*, 1889; and especially the excellent thesis of G. B. Churchill, *Richard III bis Shakespeare*, 1897, and his enlargement of the theme in *Palæstra*, x, 1900. See, also, E. Rhys, "Study of Richard III," *Harper's Magazine*, January, 1904. On the trilogy of *Henry IV* and *V:* M. Morgann, *On the Dramatic Character of Falstaff*, 1777; G. A. Schmeding, *Essay on Shakespeare's Henry V*, 1784; E. A. Struve, *Studien zu Shakespeares Heinrich IV*, 1851; B. Tschischwitz, *Shakespeares Staat und Königthum*, 1866; W. Beaumont, *On Three Dramas of Shakespeare*, 1879. For the relation of Falstaff to the braggart in general, see J. Thümmel, "Der Miles Gloriosus bei Shakespeare," *Jahrbuch*, xiii, 1878; and H. Graf, *Der Miles Gloriosus im englischen Drama*, 1891. On the *Character of Falstaff as originally exhibited*, see J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps' essay of that title, 1841; also J. Gairdner, "The Historical Element in Shakespeare's Falstaff," *Fortnightly*, March, 1873. See, also, W. Baeske, "Oldcastle-Falstaff in der englischen Literatur bis zur Shakespeare," *Palæstra*, I, 1905; "Henry V and Sir John Old Castle," *Review of Reviews*, xxxii, 1905; and *The First Part of Sir John Oldcastle*, edited by J. R. Macarthur, Chicago, 1907.

On **Thomas Heywood as a writer of historical plays**, see *The English Chronicle Play*, *s. v.;* and the Introduction to *Edward IV*, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1842. On the sources of the pseudo-historical *James IV of Scotland*, see *Athenæum*, October 8, 1881; and Creizenach in *Anglia*, viii, 1885; on

*George a Greene*, R. Sachs in *Jahrbuch*, xxvii, 1892. *Fair Em* is elaborately discussed by Simpson in his *School of Shakspere*, ii, 1878; the Introduction to the edition of this play by Warnke and Proescholdt, 1883, should also be consulted. For a word concerning *Nobody and Somebody*, see *Jahrbuch*, xxix-xxx, 1894, where it is translated into German by J. Bolte.

On Munday and Chettle's later plays on *Robin Hood*, see A. Ruckdeschel, 1897. See, also, Collier's Introduction to *Five Old Plays*, 1833, in which *The Downfall of Robert Earl of Huntingdon* is reprinted and the same editor's edition of *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1851. The latest account of **Anthony Munday** is that of J. Seccombe, *D. N. B.* xxxix, 1893. Bullen wrote the earlier article on **Henry Chettle**, *ibid.* x, 1887. An account of Chettle's dramatic activity is to be found in R. Ackermann's ed. of *Hoffman*, 1894, itself taken largely from the earlier edition of 'H. B. L.' 1852. Chettle and Day's *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green* is reprinted by W. Bang, *Materialien zur Kunde*, i, 1902. Chettle's *Kindheart's Dream* has been reprinted in *Percy Society's Publications*, v, 1841. The notorious passage concerning Shakespeare is most easily available in Ingleby's "Century of Praise," *New Sh. Soc. Publ.* revised by L. Toulmin Smith, 1879. As to Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, see the paragraphs on the pastoral drama, section xvi, below. As to the **biographical chronicles**: for *Sir Thomas More*, see the Introduction to the edition by A. Dyce, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1844; and R. Simpson in *Notes and Queries*, series iv, vol. viii, 1871. *Cromwell* is discussed with other pseudo-Shakespearean plays by R. Sachs in *Jahrbuch*, xxvii, 1892, as above. *Stukeley* (with its source) is exhaustively treated by R. Simpson in his *School of Shakspere*, vol. ii, 1878; and referred partly to the authorship of Fletcher by E. H. C. Oliphant in *Notes and Queries*, series x, vol. iii, 1905. On the **Tudor group of chronicle plays**, see K. Elze, "Zu Heinrich VIII," *Jahrbuch*, ix, 1874; J. Spedding, "The Several Shares of Shakspere

and Fletcher in *Henry VIII*," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874. N. Delius, "Fletcher's angebliche Betheiligung an Shakespeare's *King Henry VIII*," *ibid.* xiv, 1879; R. Boyle, in the same, 1885, denies all but a scene of this play to Shakespeare. On the relations of *Henry VIII* to other plays of its class, see K. Elze's edition of Samuel Rowley's *When You See Me You Know Me*, 1874. Dekker and Heywood's *Sir Thomas Wyatt* and the latter's *If You Know Not Me* were edited together by J. Blew, 1876. Among the plays dealing with travel and adventure, see Bullen in *The Works of John Day*, 1881, vol. ii; A. E. H. Swaen, Introduction to Daborne's *Christian Turned Turk*, *Anglia*, xx, 1898; and Bullen's remarks preceding his reprint of *Dick of Devonshire*, *Old English Plays*, 1881, vol. ii.

For discussion and bibliographies of **Shakespeare's mythical histories**, *King Lear* and *Macbeth*, see the wholly admirable volumes of H. H. Furness, the former dating 1880, the latter, now revised by H. H. Furness, Jr., 1903. The story employed by Shakespeare in these two tragedies has recently attracted renewed attention: E. Bode, "Die Learsage vor Shakespeare," *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, xvii; W. Perrett, " The Story of King Lear from Geoffrey of Monmouth to Shakespeare," *Palæstra*, xxxv; E. Kröger, "Die Saga von Macbeth bis zu Shakespeare," the same, xxxix; all of 1904. A broader treatment of the general sources of the legendary chronicle histories is that of L. Oehninger, *Die Verbreitung der Königssagen der Historia Regum Britanniæ von Geoffrey of Monmouth in der poetischen Elizabethanischen Literatur*, also 1904. A. C. Bradley's admirable *Shakespearean Tragedy* (third impression, 1905) may be recommended for new light on these and other overwritten heroes. A recent word on the date of *King Lear* is that of A. R. Law, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xxi, 1906. For *Cymbeline*, see below, the paragraphs on Romance and Tragicomedy, section xvii.

For **other mythical histories**: on *The Birth of Merlin* see the Introduction of Warnke and Proescholdt's edition,

1887; the play is discussed in every account of pseudo-Shakespeare. *The Authorship of Merlin* is discussed by F. A. Howe in *Mod. Phil.* iv, 1906. For *The Mayor of Queenborough*, see the Introduction to Bullen's *Works of Middleton*, 1885. *Fatum Vortigerni* is described in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 1898; *Nobody and Somebody* is reprinted in *Jahrbuch*, xxix and xxx, 1893; Heywood's *Royal King and Loyal Subject* appears edited by K. W. Tibbals in *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, 1906. V. Kreb edited *The Valiant Welshman*, *Münchener Beiträge*, xxiii, 1902. *The Valiant Scot* will shortly appear, edited by J. L. Carver; *The Duchess of Suffolk*, by M. A. Carpenter, also theses of the University of Pennsylvania, 1904 and 1907. The source of Rowley's *Shoemaker a Gentleman* appears in *Palæstra*, xviii, 1903, edited by A. F. Lange; the play is promised with the other plays of Rowley edited by C. W. Stork, University of Pennsylvania. Lastly, for Fletcher's *Bonduca*, see B. Leonhardt, *Engl. Stud.* xiii, 1890; for *King John and Matilda*, *Retrospective Review*, 1821, and Bullen's Introduction, *Works of Robert Davenport*, *Old English Plays*, vol. iii, 1890; for that play, V. Gehler, *Das Verhältnis von Ford's Perkin Warbeck zu Bacon's Henry VII*, 1895, and the ed. of *Perkin Warbeck* by J. P. Pickburn and J. LeG. Brereton, 1896.

## VII. DOMESTIC DRAMA

The domestic drama as such has not received a specific treatment, although parts of the subject, as will appear below, have claimed the attention of various scholars. An excellent discussion of earlier comedy, which was largely realistic in its emergence from the miracle, morality, and interlude, is that of C. M. Gayley, "An Historical View of the Beginnings of English Comedy," prefixed to *Representative English Comedies*, 1903. On its tragic side, domestic drama is treated in larger range by H. W. Singer, *Das bürgerliche Trauerspiel in England*, Leipzig Diss. 1891.

The best account of the document known as Henslowe's Diary is that of W. W. Greg in the Introduction to his careful reprint, 1904. A promised second volume of notes and further comment has not yet appeared. This work quite supersedes the ed. of J. P. Collier, published for the Shakespeare Society in 1845, impaired as it is by aspersions on the earlier honest extracts of Malone (see his ed. of *Shakspeare*, 1823, vol. iii), by inaccuracy and by indubitable instances of tampering with the text. On this topic and the collections at Dulwich in general, see Greg, as above; G. F. Warner, *Catalogue of the Manuscripts, etc., at Dulwich*, 1881; W. Young, *History of Dulwich*, 2 vols., 1889; and F. B. Bickley, *Catalogue* of the same, 1903. For popular accounts of Henslowe, see E. R. Buckley, "The Elizabethan Playwright in his Workshop," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1903; and the present author's "Plays in the Making," *The Queen's Progress*, 1904. Some interesting particulars as to Henslowe's mart will be found, too, in L. Whitaker, "Michael Drayton as a Dramatist," *University of Pennsylvania Thesis, Mod. Lang. Publ.* 1903. For other authorities concerning Elizabethan traffic with the stage, see the foregoing paragraphs of this Essay, section iv, and the many details industriously gathered into the Malone *Variorum Shakspeare*, 1823, vol. iii. Halliwell-Phillipps' *Outlines* and S. Lee's *Life of Shakespeare* should also be consulted as to these and like matters.

Among comedies of simple domestic type, *The Two Angry Women of Abington* and its author, Henry Porter, are well discussed by Gayley in his *Representative Comedies*. *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* was competently edited by Warnke and Proescholdt, 1884; and more recently and briefly by H. Walker, *Temple Dramatists*, 1897. Dekker's alleged part in this comedy is treated, with his share in other plays, by O. Elton, *An Introduction to Michael Drayton*, for the Spenser Society, 1895; and by L. Whitaker, *Michael Drayton*, as above. On Shakespeare's alleged part in *The Merry Devil*, see H. von Friesen, *Jahrbuch*, i, 1865. A

convenient résumé of the questions of source, date, and other matters concerning *The Merry Wives* will be found in Ward, ii. See, also, P. A. Daniel's discussion of the relation of the quarto of *The Merry Wives* to the folio, the traditions concerning the play and Sir Thomas Lucy, in his ed. of the quarto of 1602, *Shakspere Facsimilies* as above. See, also, the several tracts of Halliwell-Phillipps on this play, especially *Observations on the Charlecote Traditions*, 1887. For Falstaff, see above, section vi of this Essay. *The New Inn* is edited with apparatus, as the Yale Thesis of G. B. Tennant, 1907.

The only complete ed. of *The Dramatic Works of* Thomas Dekker is the unsatisfactory reprint by R. H. Shepherd, 4 vols., 1873. The *Mermaid ed.* by E. Rhys contains the better known plays. Dekker's non-dramatic works were edited by A. B. Grosart, 5 vols., 1884–86. Vol. v contains a brief *Memorial-Introduction*. An interesting estimate of Dekker is that of A. C. Swinburne, *Nineteenth Century*, January, 1887; the fullest account of his work is that of A. H. Bullen in *D. N. B.* xiv, 1888. *The Gull's Hornbook*, 1609, has been frequently reprinted, first by G. F. Nott in 1812. Convenient later eds. are those of G. Saintsbury, *Elizabethan and Jacobean Pamphlets*, 1892, and of R. B. McKerrow, 1904. On the influence of Dedekind's *Grobianus* on this book of Dekker's, see Herford, *Literary Relations*. *Patient Grissil* was reprinted for the *Old Sh. Soc.* by Collier, 1841; and with the non-dramatic works of Dekker by Grosart, vol. v; a separate critical ed. is that of G. Hübsch, 1893. Two early black-letter tracts, Dekker's and his collaborator's sources, were edited by Collier for the *Old Sh. Soc.* 1842. For other versions of the story see Ward, i. See, also, W. Bang in *Archiv*, cvii, 1900. The *Shoemakers' Holiday* has not been separately edited. Its source, Thomas Deloney's *Gentle Craft*, 1597, is reprinted in full by F. Lange, *Palæstra*, xviii, 1903. The quarto of *Old Fortunatus*, 1600, has been carefully edited with full apparatus by H. Scherer in *Münchener Beiträge*,

xxi, 1901; the comedy is also included in the *Temple Dramatists*, 1904, edited by O. Smeaton. Dekker's play early attracted the attention of German scholarship, as appears from the translation of V. Schmidt, 1819; and the notice by J. Zacher in Ersch and Grüber's *Encyklopädie*, and J. Tittmann in "Die Schauspiele der englischen Komödianten in Deutschland," *Deutsche Dichter des 16ten Jahrhunderts*, xiii, 1880. The relation of Dekker's comedy to the old German *Volksbuch*, 1509, its ultimate source, is succinctly set forth by Herford in his *Literary Relations;* by B. Lázár, *Ueber das Fortunatus Märchen*, 1897; and by Scherer as above. On the English prose versions of the story, see J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, "Descriptive Notices of Popular Histories," *Percy Society's Publications*, xxix, 1848. *The Honest Whore* is reprinted in eds. of Dekker. See, especially, the *Mermaid ed.* of that poet by E. Rhys, 1887.

The **faithful wife as a motive** in the drama has not been specifically treated; a brief account, however, of the group of plays to which it belongs will be found in the ed. of *The Fair Maid of Bristow* by A. H. Quinn, *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, 1902; and a wider treatment of the theme is that of O. Siefken, *Das geduldige Weib in der englischen Literatur*, 1903. The older vagary concerning Shakespeare's possible hand in *The London Prodigal* is sufficiently epitomized by Ward, vol. ii. For *How a Man may Choose a Good Wife* and Wilkins' *Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, see the prefatory remarks to the reprints of these plays in Hazlitt's *Dodsley*, v and vi. Fleay, *s. v.*, vol. ii, especially discusses the relation of the latter play to *The Yorkshire Tragedy*. E. Koeppel treats of the sources of *The Dutch Courtesan* in his *Quellen*, i. The earlier dramas on the prodigal son are discussed by Herford; while Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, ii, prints a translation of a *Comedy of The Prodigal Son* derived from the German collection of English plays of 1620.

The only complete reprint of the dramatic works of

**Thomas Heywood** is that of Pearson, 6 vols., 1874. Several of the plays were, however, reprinted earlier by B. Field and J. P. Collier, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1842–54. As to Heywood and his work, see the latter editor in his ed. of *An Apology for Actors*, for the same society, 1841; J. A. Symonds' *Introduction* to A. W. Verity's ed. of *Select Plays by Heywood*, for *Mermaid Series*, 1888; and the earlier essays in the *Retrospective Review*, xi, 1825, and *Edinburgh Review*, lxxiii, 1841. The fullest notice of Heywood is that of A. W. Ward in *D. N. B.* xxvi, 1891. See, also, the same editor's Introduction to *The Woman Killed with Kindness*, *Temple Dramatists*, 1897. This play was also edited with Introduction by Collier in 1850; as *The Fair Maid of the Exchange* (probably not Heywood's) was edited by B. Field in 1845. *The Captives* was discovered in manuscript and printed by Bullen, *Old English Plays*, 1883, vol. iv. G. L. Kittredge, in *Journal of Germanic Philology*, ii, 1900, finds the underplot of this play in a French fabliau. O. Kaempfer, in his Halle Diss. 1903, examines *Das Verhältnis von Heywood's Royal King and Loyal Subject zu Painter's Palace of Pleasure;* and K. W. Tibbals edits this play with critical apparatus, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1906. W. Bang reprints *Pleasant Dialogues and Dramas* in *Materialien zur Kunde*, iii, 1903; and the same with H. de Vocht, in *Engl. Stud.* xxxvi, 1906, discusses Heywood's contact with "*Klassiker und Humanisten.*" The other plays of Heywood will be found mentioned in their respective classes.

A brief list of the plays into which **the shrew** enters **as a type** will be found in the present author's ed. of *Tom Tyler and his Wife*, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xv, i, 1900. The ordering of several of these plays is attempted by Boyle in *Engl. Stud.* xv, 1891. On Shakespeare's *Taming of the Shrew*, see the résumé of Ward, vol. ii. The most complete discussion of the relations of this play to the older *Taming of a Shrew* and to Gascoigne's *Supposes* is that of A. H. Tolman, first broached in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* v, 1890, and revised in *The Views about Hamlet*, 1906. In "What Has

Become of *Love's Labour's Won?*" *Chicago Decennial Publications*, the same critic discusses the possible identity of *The Shrew* with that title of Meres' mention. In the *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874, Fleay questioned Shakespeare's authorship of *The Shrew*. On the sources see Ward as above; R. Urbach, *Das Verhältnis des The Taming of the Shrew zu seinen Quellen*, 1887; and the note of W. A. Neilson, *Works of Shakespeare*, 1906. See, also, A. von Weilen, *Shakespeares Vorspiel zu der Widerspenstigen Zähmung*, 1884.

**The murder plays** were first distinguished by Collier, *History of Dramatic Literature*, vol. iii. For a wider discussion of the subject, see Singer, *Das bürgerliche Trauerspiel*, as above. *Arden of Feversham* has been reprinted by E. Jacob, 1770; by H. Tyrell, *Doubtful Plays of Shakespeare*, 1851; N. Delius, *Pseudo-Shakspere'sche Dramen*, 1855; A. H. Bullen, 1887; K. Warnke and L. Proescholdt, 1888; and lastly by R. Bayne, *Temple Dramatists*, 1897. The last three eds. discuss the play, its source, and the question of its authorship. On the last topic, see, especially, Swinburne, *A Study of Shakespeare*, 1880, the summary of Bayne, and C. Cushman in *Jahrbuch*, xxxix, 1903. *A Warning for Fair Women* is reprinted with introductory remarks by R. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, 1878, vol. ii. Bullen, *Old English Plays*, vol. iv, reprints *Two Tragedies in One*. On all of these plays the more general authorities, such as Ward and Fleay, should be likewise consulted.

On the general topic of the **supernatural as represented in Elizabethan drama**, see a paper of the present author in *Mod. Phil.* i, 1903. The monumental contemporary work is Reginald Scot's *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, 1584, edited by B. Nicholson, 1886, with an excellent introduction. See, also, T. A. Spalding, *Elizabethan Demonology*, 1880; for the earlier lore and authorities on witchcraft in literature and the drama, see Herford. The same authority discusses the marriage of Belphegor in Elizabethan drama. See, also, E. Hollstein, *Verhältnis von Jonson's The Devil is an Ass und Wilson's Belphegor zu Machiavelli's Novelle von Bel-*

*fagor*, 1901. The former play is exhaustively edited by W. S. Johnson, *Yale Studies*, xxix, 1905. The topic of the relation of Middleton's *Witch* to the witches of *Macbeth* is thoroughly discussed with citation of the authorities by H. H. Furness, *Variorum ed.* of the latter play, new ed. by H. H. Furness, Jr., 1903. The earlier discussion of the matter, which began with Steevens, was crystallized by W. G. Clark and W. A. Wright in their ed. of *Macbeth*, 1869; see Fleay, in his various publications on the topic as well; and T. A. Spalding's "attempt to rebut some of [Fleay's] arguments," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1877–79.

## VIII. ROMANTIC COMEDY

Aside from the treatment of the important theme, **the influence of Italian literature upon that of England,** in all histories of the literature of the age, see J. R. Murray, "The Influence of Italian upon English Literature during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries" (*Le Bas Prize Essay*), 1886; D. Hannay, *The Later Renaissance*, 1898; L. Fränkel, "Romanische insbesondere italienische Wechselbeziehungen zur englischen Litteratur," *Kritischer Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der romanischen Philologie*, 1900; and L. Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England*, Columbia Thesis, 1902.

On the Italian literature from which the influences affecting English were chiefly drawn, see J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, 1897–98, vols. iv and v, on Italian literature; B. Weise and E. Pèrcopo, *Geschichte der italienischen Litteratur von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart*, 1899, is excellent, especially in its summaries of the latest work on this subject; A. D'Ancona and O. Bacci, *Manuele della Litteratura Italiana*, 5 vols., 1897–1900, contains much valuable biographical and bibliographical material. On **the Italian Novella, chief source of Elizabethan romantic comedy** and tragedy, see E. Koeppel, "Studien zur Geschichte der italienischen Novelle in der englischen Litteratur

des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts," *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxx, 1892. The application of these and other sources to English drama is contained in the same author's excellent "Quellen Studien," *Münchener Beiträge*, xi, and *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxxii, together with his "Zur Quellen-Kunde des Stuart-Dramas," *Archiv*, xcvii, 1895–97. A. Ott endeavors a continuation of the first of these works in *Die italienische Novelle im englischen Drama von* 1600 *bis zur Restauration*, 1904. Of wider scope than these are the valuable extended lists (including both fiction and the drama) of M. A. Scott in her "Elizabethan Translations from the Italian," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* x to xiv, 1895–99. See, likewise, the same author's *The Elizabethan Drama, especially in its Relations to the Italians of the Renaissance*, Yale Thesis, 1894. Earlier source work in romantic and other drama is that of M. Rapp, *Studien über das englische Theater*, 1862, though this contains much else; and K. Simrock, *Quellen des Shakespeare* (2d ed.), 1870. See, also, L. L. Schücking, *Studien über die stofflichen Beziehungen der englischen Komödie zur italienischen bis Lilly*, 1901, though discredited by Bond.

The chief Elizabethan **collections of stories translated from the Italian** which served as sources for romantic drama are William Painter, *The Palace of Pleasure*, 1566–67, edited by J. Jacobs, 3 vols., 1890; Geffraie Fenton, *Certain Tragical Discourses of Bandello*, 1567, edited by R. L. Douglas, *Tudor Translations*, 2 vols., 1898; and *Bartholomew Riche, his Farewell to the Military Profession*, 1581, edited by J. P. Collier for the *Old Sh. Soc.* 1846. Other like collections will be found described by Scott, as above. Most of the sources of Shakespeare's comedies, as of his other plays, will be found reprinted in W. C. Hazlitt's ed. of Collier's *Shakespeare's Library*, 7 vols., 1875.

On the relations of **Shakespeare's earlier comedies** to Chaucer, see O. Ballmann, "Chaucer's Einfluss auf das englische Drama," *Anglia*, xxv, 1902; on the relations of Shakespeare's comedies to Euphuism and to the plays of

Lyly, see W. L. Rushton, *Shakespeare's Euphuisms*, 1871; F. Landmann, *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1880–82; J. Goodlet in *Engl. Stud.* v, 1882; and the résumé of the topic in Bond's *Lyly*, 1902, vols. ii and iii. G. Sarrazin, *Jahrbuch*, xxix-xxx, 1893–94, writes suggestively "Zur Chronologie von Shakespeare Jugend-dramen." Fleay argues that *Love's Labour's Lost*, as we have it, is a revision, in "Shakespeare and Puritanism," *Anglia*, vii, 1885 (see, also, the discussion of this matter in his *Life of Shakespeare*, 1886); C. F. McClumpha in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, June, 1900, discusses the relations of this play to the Sonnets; while W. Keller in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 1898, sets forth the alleged influence of *Pedantius* on the same comedy. The allusive and topical side of *Love's Labour's Lost* was explained by S. Lee, "A New Study of *Love's Labour's Lost*," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1880, and in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1884 and 1887–90. These and other matters are garnered in the *Variorum ed.* of *Love's Labour's Lost*, by H. H. Furness, 1904. A résumé of the discussion concerning the date of *The Two Gentlemen of Verona* and its relations to similar stories will be found in Ward, vol. ii. The most important paper on this comedy is that of J. Zupitza, "Ueber die Fabel in Shakespeare's Beiden Veronesern," *Jahrbuch*, xxiii, 1888.

*The Merchant of Venice*, *Much Ado*, *As You Like It*, and *Twelfth Night* are all happily included in Furness' *Variorum Shakespeare*, and no study of any one of these comedies can begin anywhere save in these monuments of scholarly industry, self-abnegation, and research. The mooted question of the relations of the two quartos of *The Merchant of Venice* has been more recently set forth in the Forewords to the facsimiles of these eds. by F. J. Furnivall, 1887. As to the influence of Marlowe's *Jew of Malta*, see K. Elze, *Jahrbuch*, vi, and Ward, i; for *Der Jud von Venedig*, J. Meissner, *Die englischen Comödianten in Oesterreich*, 1884. N. J. Halpin, *The Dramatic Unities of Shakespeare*, 1849, applied to *The Merchant of Venice* J. Wilson's theory of Shakespeare's use of two different

computations of time in the same play to effect dramatic illusion. See, also, P. A. Daniel, *Time Analysis of the Plots of Shakespeare's Plays*, *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1879, and *ibid.* 1875–76 and 1877–79 for certain reprints of older work on the topic. On the Jews in England, see, especially, S. Lee, "The Original Shylock," *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1880; and the same author's "Elizabethan England and the Jews," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1887–92. The various conceptions of Shylock are sufficiently set forth by Furness, as is the interminable discussion of the "law" in the trial scene. See, however, W. Hazlitt on Shylock, as on other *Characters in Shakespeare's Plays*, 1817; the interesting papers of the poet, H. H. Horne, *Shylock, a Critical Fancy*, 1838, and *Shylock, a Dramatic Review*, 1850; H. Graetz, *Shylock in den Sagen, in den Dramen, und in der Geschichte*, 1880; and the notable book of R. von Ihring, *Der Kampf um's Recht*, 1886, and his critics. Specimens of the "prophetic glorification" of the Jew are F. Hawkins in *The Theatre*, 1879, and M. Jastrow, *Penn Monthly*, 1880. F. F. Heard wrote of *The Legal Acquirements of Shakespeare*, 1865; and *Shakespeare as a Lawyer*, 1885. See, also, F. Freund, "Shakespeare als Rechtsphilosoph," *Jahrbuch*, xxviii, 1893.

The "staying" of the publication of *Much Ado About Nothing* is sufficiently explained with reference to the requisite authorities in the preface of the *Variorum ed.* of that comedy, 1899; there too will be found, as in all these cases, the inevitable discussion of date and of source. The opinion that *Much Ado* owes anything to Jacob Ayrer's *Die Schöne Phœnicia* (once stoutly maintained in Germany) is now set at rest once and for all in the same volume. On the relation of this comedy to Greene's "Lylian romances" see C. H. Herford in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1888. P. A. Daniel contributes the Introduction to the facsimile reproduction of the quarto of 1600 of this play. The obvious comparison of *As You Like It* with its source, Lodge's *Rosalynd*, was made by W. G. Stone, *New Sh. Soc. Trans.*

1882; N. Delius in *Jahrbuch*, vi, 1871, denied the older opinion that *As You Like It* was in any wise based upon "Chaucer's" *Tale of Gamelyn;* and J. Zupitza went over the ground of both again in *Jahrbuch*, xxi, 1886. H. Smith, *Pastoral Influence in the English Drama*, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1897, treats of the relation of this play to the pastoral; and the same theme is further discussed by W. W. Greg, *English Pastoral Poetry and Drama*, 1906. See, also, A. H. Thorndike, "The Relation of *As You Like It* to the Robin Hood Plays," *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iv, 1902. To the four plays and three novels discussed by the older critics as among possible sources of *Twelfth Night* may now be added the Latin comedy, *Lælia*, described by G. B. Churchill and W. Keller, *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 1898. For a discussion of the character Malvolio, see Furness. The best word on the topic remains that of Charles Lamb, *On Some of the Old Actors*, written in 1823.

The mooted question of the date of *All's Well* and whether it be capable of identification with *Love's Labour's Won* or not is given in résumé by Ward, vol. ii. See, also, F. G. Fleay, "On Certain Plays of Shakespeare of which Portions were written at Different Periods of his Life," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874, and his *Life of Shakespeare;* R. G. White, *Studies in Shakespeare*, 1885; and A. H. Tolman, *Decennial Publications*, University of Chicago, 1903. An early examination of Shakespeare's acknowledged source for *Measure for Measure* is that of K. Foth, "Shakespeare's Mass für Mass und die Geschichte von Promos und Cassandra," *Jahrbuch*, xiii, 1878. On the double title-page and other matters concerning the quartos of *Troilus and Cressida*, see H. P. Stokes, Introduction to *Troilus, Shakspere-Quarto Facsimiles*, n. d.; and on its inclusion in the Shakespeare Folio, Lee's reproduction, 1902, Introduction. On the alleged earlier versions combined to form the present text, see Fleay as above in the *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874; and the arguments in favor of its burlesque and allusive character advanced by R. Simpson in the same, 1875–76,

and in his *School of Shakspere*, 1878, vol. ii. *Die Troilus-Fabel* early engaged the attention of German scholars, being treated at large by K. Eitner, *Jahrbuch*, iii, 1868, and by H. Düntzer, *Die Sage vom trojanischen Kriege*, 1869; W. Hertzberg, *Jahrbuch*, vi, 1871, discussing more particularly "Die Quellen der Troilus-Sage in ihrem Verhältnisse zu Troilus und Cressida;" whilst H. Ulrici endeavors to determine, "Ist Troilus und Cressida Comedy, oder Tragedy, oder History," in the same, ix, 1874. See, also, the discussion of this play by R. Boyle in *Engl. Stud.* xxx, 1902.

On the title of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, much argued and questioned in Germany (*e. g.* K. Simrock, *Plots of Shakespeare's Plays*, tr. *Old Sh. Soc.* 1840, and H. Kurz, *Jahrbuch*, v, 1869), see the Preface to Furness' *Variorum ed.* of that play. The arguments concerning the date of this play from Capell and Steevens to Furnivall, and the various sources, alleged and surmised, have been similarly epitomized by the same indefatigable editor. G. Massey, *The Secret Drama of Shakespeare's Sonnets*, 1866, 3d ed. 1888, K. Elze and H. Kurz in *Jahrbuch*, iii and iv, 1868–69, and F. G. Fleay, *Shakespeare*, 1886, and *Chronicle*, 1891, discuss the occasion of this comedy; and the last, with Ten Brink, in *Jahrbuch*, xiii, 1878, and H. P. Stokes, *Chronological Order of Shakespeare's Plays*, 1878, discern allusions to Greene and contemporary caricature in certain passages. Equally fertile has been the discussion of the sources of *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, for which, with other matters, see N. J. Halpin, *Oberon's Vision*, *Sh. Soc.* 1843; J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Illustrations of the Fairy Mythology of A Mid Summernight's Dream*, *ibid.* 1845; W. Bell, *Shakespeare's Puck and his Fairy Lore*, 3 vols., 1852; P. A. Daniel, *Time Analysis of the Plots of Shakespeare's Plays*, *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1877–79; T. S. Baynes, "What Shakspeare learnt at School," *Fraser's Magazine*, xxi, 1880; G. Hart, *Die Pyramus und Thisbe-Sage*, 1889–91. Ward, in vol. ii of his 2d ed. 1899, dis-

cusses the relation of Shakespeare's play to Greene's *James IV;* the present author, "Some Features of the Supernatural as represented in Plays of the Reign of Elizabeth and James," *Mod. Phil.* i, 1903. T. F. T. Dyer, *Folk-Lore of Shakespeare*, American ed. 1884, should also be consulted.

Among **other romantic comedies,** Jonson's *Case is Altered* is reprinted and discussed by Gifford, and in Cunningham's note in their ed. of Jonson, vol. vi. For *Blurt, Master Constable*, and *The Old Law*, the reader is referred to Bullen's *Middleton*, vol. i, and Ward. The date of the latter play is theme for E. C. Morris, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xvii, 1902. *Faustus*, *Friar Bacon*, *Fortunatus*, and *The Merry Devil of Edmonton* have already found treatment above. *John a Kent* was reprinted for the *Old Sh. Soc.* in 1851, by Collier; *The Devil's Charter*, edited by R. B. McKerrow, appears in *Materialien zur Kunde*, vi, 1904. The Works of **John Day** were first collected by A. H. Bullen, 2 vols., 1881; the same writer contributed a notice of Day to *D. N. B.* xiv, 1888. An important essay on Day is that of A. C. Swinburne, *Nineteenth Century*, 1897. *Humor out of Breath* and *The Parliament of Bees* were competently edited for the *Mermaid Series*, the vol. entitled *Nero and Other Plays*, by A. Symons, 1888. In 1860 Halliwell-Phillipps published a limited ed. (50 copies) of the former play.

## IX. HISTORICAL DRAMA ON FOREIGN THEMES

**Foreign historical subjects as themes for the drama** have not been treated before as such. The chief contemporary sources for Italian history are W. Thomas, *The Historie of Italy*, 1549; and the translations of Guicciardini, by G. Fenton, 1579; and of Macchiavelli's *Florentine History*, by T. Bedingfield, 1595. The drama on Italian subjects drew more frequently from the *novellieri* (for whom see the section above). Books on travel and anecdote af-

forded other material. For Italian books printed and translated in England during the period, see, especially, the full lists of M. A. Scott in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* x to xiv, 1895–99; and L. Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England*, as above. For French history, the general later source seems to have been E. Grimestone's *General Inventory of the History of France*, 1607, a compendium of de Serres, Matthieu, Cayet, and others. Grimestone also translated a *History of the Netherlands*, 1608, a *History of Spaine*, 1612, and several other like works; but they appear little to have concerned the drama. As to German sources in the drama of the time, see, especially, the Introduction by K. Elze to his ed. of *Alphonsus of Germany*, 1867; and Herford, *Literary Relations of England and Germany*, 1886.

Among the **plays based on Italian history**, the usual eds. of Middleton and Webster discuss the sources of *Women Beware Women* and *Vittoria Corombona*. *The Devil's Charter* is well edited by R. B. McKerrow, *Materialien zur Kunde*, vi, 1904, who has likewise a note on this play in *Notes and Queries*, series 10, vol. i, 1904. See, also, as to Barnes, J. Knight, *Athenæum*, 1904. On "Macchiavelli and the Elizabethan Drama," see E. Meyer, *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, i, 1897. On several plays of this and other classes, see A. Dessoff, "Ueber englische, italienische und spanische Dramen in den Spielverzeichnissen deutscher Wandertruppen," *Studien für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte* i, 1901.

*The Dramatic Works* of **George Chapman** were first collected and reprinted by Pearson in 1873 in 3 vols. R. H. Shepherd edited Chapman complete, 1874–75, one volume containing the plays, a second the translations, a third the miscellaneous works. To this last A. C. Swinburne contributed an interesting essay on the poet. *The Best Plays of Chapman*, edited by W. L. Phelps, appear in one of the volumes of the *Mermaid Series*, 1895. The two plays on D'Ambois are edited by F. S. Boas for the *Belles Lettres Series*, 1906; *All Fools* and *The Gentleman Usher*, by T.

M. Parrott, 1907, for the same. A. H. Bullen contributed the notice of Chapman in *D. N. B.* x, 1887; and B. Dobell in *Athenæum*, March 30, 1901, adds some interesting particulars. Chapman's sources are well discussed by E. Koeppel, *Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Chapman's*, etc., 1897. But see, also, on this topic, F. S. Boas, "The Sources of Chapman's *The Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron*, and *The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*," *Athenæum*, January 10, 1903; and his "Edward Grimestone, Translator and Sargeant at Arms," *Mod. Phil.* iii, 1906. A valuable earlier essay is that of F. Bodenstedt, "Chapman in seinem Verhältniss zu Shakespeare," *Jahrbuch*, i, 1865. Chapman's historical dramas are examined by E. Lehmann in his ed. of *Chabot, Admiral of France*, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1906; "On the Dates of Some of Chapman's Plays," see E. E. Stoll, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 1905.

On the historical significance of several **plays based on French history**, Rowley's *Noble Spanish Soldier*, Fletcher's *Thierry and Theodoret*, and Massinger's *Believe as You List*, Fleay, *Chronicle*, should be consulted. On the sources of the latter and of *Rollo, the Bloody Brother*, see the *Quellen Studien* of Koeppel, i, 1895; on their authorship, Oliphant in *Engl. Stud.* xv, 1891.

**William Rowley** has been well considered, especially in his relation to his chief collaborator, by P. G. Wiggin in her *The Middleton-Rowley Plays*, 1897. T. Seccombe writes the article on Rowley in *D. N. B.* xlix, of the same year. No collection of Rowley's plays has ever been made; but a critical ed. of his *All's Lost by Lust* with *The Spanish Gypsy*, by E. P. Morris, 1907, has just appeared in the *Belles Lettres Series;* and the former play, edited by C. W. Stork, Pennsylvania Thesis, is now in press. A. H. Bullen has long had in project a complete ed. of Rowley. An article on *Shakespeare and Rowley*, by W. Zeittin, will be found in *Anglia*, iv, 1881. *The Birth of Merlin* was edited by Warnke and Proescholdt, 1887. For the relation of Peele's *Battle of Alcazar* and *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy* to certain his-

torical pamphlets, see Bullen's *Peele*, and Dodsley, *Old Plays*, ed. 1825. The Spanish historical sources of Fletcher's *Island Princess*, *Wife for a Month*, and other plays are also treated by Koeppel, i.

Among **dramas** of an historical cast, the scene of which is laid in **Germany and adjacent northern countries**, the following have been critically edited: *Alphonsus of Germany*, by K. Elze, with an excellent Introduction, 1867; *A Larum for London*, by R. Simpson, 1872 (for a further account of this play and a denial of its ascription to Gascoigne, see the present author's monograph on that poet, *Publications of the University of Pennsylvania*, 1892); and *The Hector of Germany*, by L. W. Payne, Jr., Pennsylvania Thesis, 1906. *The Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, *The Costly Whore*, and *Barnavelt* are contained in Bullen's *Old English Plays*, 1888, and each is preceded by a sufficient account. The sources of all are discussed by Koeppel, ii. Bullen has also given especial attention in his ed. of Middleton, vol. vii, to the sources as well as to the historical and personal allusions of *The Game at Chess;* and he may be supplemented by reference to Ward and Fleay. An earlier contribution on the subject is that of J. Hornby, *Old Sh. Soc.* 1845; a very recent one, E. C. Morris, "An Allegory in Middleton's *Game at Chess*," *Engl. Stud.* xxxviii, 1907.

The general source for **English dramatists** dealing with the **history of the Ottoman empire** is Knolles' *General History of the Turks*, 1603. As to *Soliman and Perseda* and *Selimus*, see above, respectively, the paragraphs on Kyd and Greene, section v of this Essay. The Latin *Solymannidæ* and *Tomumbeius* are both described in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv. The most recent account of the tragedies *Alaham* and *Mustapha* will be found in *The Works of Fulke Greville*, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1903, by M. W. Croll. Koeppel, ii, discusses the sources of *Revenge for Honor; Osmond* is incidentally considered by C. H. Gray, *Lodowick Carliell*, Chicago Thesis, 1905.

## X. THE COMEDY OF HUMORS AND THE WAR OF THE THEATERS

On the history of **Plautus in medieval and later drama,** see K. von Reinhardstöttner, *Plautus, Spätere Bearbeitungen plautinischer Lustspiele*, 1886. Aside from the incidental treatment of these subjects in the larger histories, M. W. Wallace discusses the Influence of Plautus and Terence on earlier English drama in the Introduction to his edition of *The Birthe of Hercules*, 1903; H. Graf, *Der Miles Gloriosus im englischen Drama*, 1891; W. Claus, *Ueber die Menächmen des Plautus und ihre Nachbildung*, 1861, and A. Roeder the still narrower *Menechmi and Amphitruo im englischen Drama*, 1904. For the university plays the reader is referred to section xiv of this Essay below. Several examples of Plautine Latin comedies by English writers are described in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 1898.

The sources of **Chapman in comedy,** as in serious drama, are fully discussed by Koeppel, "Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Chapman's," *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxxii, 1897; see, also, E. Woodbridge in *Journal of Germanic Philology*, i, 1899, on "An Unnoted Source of Chapman's *All Fools;*" and M. Stier, who, in his Halle Diss. 1901, investigates the "Quellen" of the same. The influence of Italian comedy on the comedies of Chapman is the theme of A. L. Stiefel in *Jahrbuch*, xxxv, 1899. T. M. Parrott, *Mod. Phil.* iv, 1906, assigns *Sir Giles Goosecap* to the authorship of Chapman; see, also, the recent ed. by the same, of *All Fools* and *The Gentleman Usher*, 1907, as above. For eds. of Chapman's work, see the preceding paragraph of this essay. Among other comedies of this type, *Two Plays by William Percy* were printed from manuscript by J. Haslewood for the Percy Society, 1824.

Aside from the lives and memoirs contained in general histories of literature prefixed to eds. of his works and to single plays, the best **biographies of Ben Jonson** are J. A. Symonds in *English Worthies*, 1886; F. G. Fleay's full

account in his *Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, and the article of C. H. Herford in *D. N. B.* xxx, 1892. The basis of much of our knowledge of Jonson is contained in his *Conversations with Drummond*, first published by D. Laing for the *Old Sh. Soc.* 1842. The older essays of O. Gilchrist on the *Charges of Ben Jonson's Enmity towards Shakespeare*, 1808, and a *Letter to Gifford*, 1811, should also be consulted; and especially the latter's famous essay, *The Proofs of Ben Jonson's Malignity from the Commentators of Shakespeare*, prefixed to his ed. of Jonson as below. There is likewise A. C. Swinburne's brilliant *Study of Ben Jonson*, 1889. The exhaustive study, *Ben Jonson, l'Homme et l'Œuvre*, by M. Castelain, 1907, already favorably known for his admirable ed. of the *Discoveries*, 1906, reaches me too late for more than mention. A *Life of Jonson* in *English Men of Letters* is promised by Gregory Smith.

The first folio of **Jonson's Works** appeared in 1616 under the supervision of the author; from 1631 to 1641 installments of a second volume were printed (perhaps without the author's sanction); and in 1640–41 a second complete volume was published. On the folio eds. see the note of B. Nicholson, *Notes and Queries*, series iv, vol. v, 1870; W. W. Greg, *Essay Introductory, A List of Masques*, 1902; and, on the authority of the folio of 1616, A. P. Van Dam and C. Stoffel in *Anglia*, xxvi, 1903. The complete works were gathered into one volume in 1692, and reprinted in 6 vols. in 1715. The first attempt at a critical ed. was that of P. Whalley, 7 vols., 1756; a projected reprint by F. G. Waldron, in 1792, proceeded no farther than a first vol.; in 1811 G. Coleman reprinted Whalley, with the plays of other dramatists. In 1816 appeared *The Works of Ben Jonson*, edited by W. Gifford, 9 vols., with an excellent memoir. A revision of Gifford by F. Cunningham, 1871 and 1875, also 9 vols., remains the best ed. of the dramatist. W. Bang has in process *Ben Jonson's Dramen in Neudruck herausgegeben nach der folio* 1616, to be completed in 4 vols. of *Materialien zur Kunde*. Another ed. is that of "Barry Corn-

wall" (B. W. Procter), 1838. *The Best Plays of Jonson* were edited by B. Nicholson, *Mermaid Series*, 3 vols. (1893–94), with an excellent Introduction by C. H. Herford. A new ed. of Jonson, edited by Herford and P. Simpson, is issuing, 2 vols. having already appeared. Among many **eds. of single plays** may be mentioned: *Every Man in His Humor*, by H. B. Wheatley, 1877; by H. Maass, Rostock Diss. 1901; and recently by W. M. Dixon in *Temple Dramatists*, 1905. The earlier version of 1601 has been reprinted by C. Grabau in *Jahrbuch*, xxxviii, 1903, and by Bang and Greg in *Materialien zur Kunde*, xi, 1905. *The Alchemist* with *Eastward Hoe*, by F. E. Schelling (not elsewhere separately edited), appears in the *Belles Lettres Series*, 1903, and *Poetaster* with Dekker's *Satiromastix*, by J. H. Penniman, is promised in the same. Notable has been the activity of Yale University in the study of Jonson, beginning with the admirable *Studies in Jonson's Comedies*, by E. Woodbridge, 1898, and A. L. Wright's unpublished study of the *Sources of Catiline*, 1901, and extending from the exhaustive eds. of the *Alchemist*, by C. H. Hathaway, Jr.; *Every Man Out of his Humor*, by A. H. Bartlett; *Bartholomew Fair*, by C. S. Alden, in 1903; to *Poetaster*, by H. S. Mallory, 1904; *The Staple of News*, by De Winter; *Volpone*, by L. H. Holt; and *The Devil is an Ass*, by W. S. Johnson; all 1905; and *Epicœne*, by A. Henry, 1906. G. B. Tennant has in press *New Inn* for the same series. The bibliographies of these theses should be consulted.

**Critical interest in Jonson** began with Dryden, particularly in his *Essay of Dramatic Poesy*, 1667–68. Langbaine, 1691, notices him; and later T. Davies in his *Dramatic Miscellanies*, 2d ed. 1785. Other earlier considerations of Jonson are the notes of C. Lamb in his *Specimens of English Dramatic Poets*, 1808; L. Tieck in *Das altenglische Theater*, 1811; A. W. Schlegel, *Dramaturgische Vorlesungen*, xxxiii, 1817; and Coleridge in *Table Talk*, 1835, and in *Literary Remains*, 1836–37. Further early German attention to Jonson is disclosed in W. H. T. Baudissin, *Ben*

*Jonson und seine Schule*, 2 vols., 1836; in the *Program*, Danzig, of A. Schmidt, 1847; the article by L. Herrig in the *Archiv*, x, 1852; H. von Friesen, "Ben Jonson, eine Studie," *Jahrbuch*, x, 1875; and in O. Ulbrich, "Ben Jonson als Lustspieldichter," *Archiv*, xlvi, 1870. Later contributions to individual features of Jonson's dramatic activity are T. Vatke, "Jonson in seinem Anfängen," *Archiv*, lxxi, 1884; W. Wilke, *Metrische Untersuchungen zu Jonson*, 1884; pursued further by the same in *Anglia*, x, 1888; F. Holthausen, "Die Quelle von *Volpone*," *Anglia*, xii, 1890; E. Leser, "On the Relations of *Epicœne* to Molière's *Médicin malgre lui* and *Femmes savantes*," *Mod. Lang. Notes*, vii, 1892; H. Hoffschulte, *Ueber Jonson's ältere Lustspiele*, 1894; P. Aronstein, "Jonson's Theorie des Lustspiels," *Anglia*, xvii, 1895; E. Koeppel's valuable *Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Jonson's*, both 1895; and W. Woodbridge's suggestive *Studies in Jonson's Comedies*, 1898; both of these already mentioned. (F. E. Schelling, "Jonson and the Classical School," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* 1898, and H. Reinsch, *Jonson's Poetik und seine Beziehungen zu Horaz*, 1899, deal in the poet's more general theory and influence.) E. P. Lumley, *The Influence of Plautus on the Comedies of Jonson*, N. Y. University Thesis, 1901, is negligible. *Notes and Queries*, series ix and x, 1903–04, contain an interesting series of notes by C. Crawford and H. C. Hart; C. G. Child discovers the relations of Jonson to Bruno in *The Nation*, lxxix, 1904; L. H. Holt contributes a note on *Volpone*, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, 1905; W. H. Browne writes on *Lucian and Jonson* in the same, 1906, and H. D. Curtis on "The Source of the Petronel-Winnifred Plot in *Eastward Hoe*," *Mod. Phil.* 1907. See, also, the important papers of P. Aronstein, "Jonson und seine Zeitgenossen," *Engl. Stud.* xxxiv, 1906; and E. Koeppel, "Ben Jonson's Wirkung auf zeitgenössische Dramatiker," *Anglistische Forschungen*, xx, 1906.

The **Martin Marprelate Controversy**, the main current of which is wholly outside of the drama, finds its place in

every history of the time. See, more particularly, E. Arber's résumé of the topic, in his *Introductory Sketch of the Marprelate Controversy*, 1879; and as to Martin on the stage, E. N. S. Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*, Yale Thesis, 1903, especially Part II and Bond's *Lyly*, as above. For other alleged allegory and satire in the earlier drama, see R. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, 1878; S. Lee in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1880–82; and Fleay, *Life of Shakespeare*, 1886.

The tragedies and comedies of **John Marston** were collected and printed in 1633; his complete works, first by J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps with *Some Account of his Life and Writings*, 3 vols., 1856; and again by A. H. Bullen with Introduction, also 3 vols., 1887. There is an interesting essay by A. C. Swinburne, *Nineteenth Century*, xxiv, 1888, and A. H. Bullen contributed the article on Marston to the *D. N. B.* xxxvi, 1893. See, too, the valuable paper of W. von Wurzbach in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiii, 1897. For the sources of Marston's plays, see Koeppel, i, 1895. See, also, R. A. Small on the "Authorship and Date of *The Insatiate Countess*," *Harvard Studies*, v, 1896; C. Winckler, "John Marston's literarische Anfänge," Breslau Diss. 1903; the same author's "Marstons Erstlingswerke und ihre Beziehungen zu Shakespeare," *Engl. Stud.* xxxiii, 1904; P. Becker, *Das Verhältnis von Marstons What You Will zu Plautus*, 1904; F. Holthausen, "Die Quelle von Marston's *What You Will*," *Jahrbuch*, xli, 1905; and E. E. Stoll, "Shakspere, Marston, and the Malcontent Type," *Mod. Phil.* iii, 1906.

**The war of the theaters** finds completest and most conservative treatment in the monograph of that title by J. H. Penniman, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1897. Divergent views will be found in "The Stage Quarrel between Ben Jonson and the So-called Poetasters," by R. A. Small, *Forschungen zur englischen Sprache und Literatur*, i, 1899. For the earlier bibliography of this mooted subject, see the incidental references of these two works, chief among which may

be named R. Cartwright, *Shakespeare and Jonson, Dramatic versus Wit Combats*, 1864; the anonymous article, "Ben Jonson's Quarrel with Shakespeare," *North British Rev.* July, 1870; R. Simpson in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1875–76, and his *School of Shakspere*, where the play *Histriomastix* will be found reprinted. The series of recent articles by H. C. Hart, in *Notes and Queries*, series ix, vols. xi and xii, 1903, which connect the Nash-Harvey controversy with that of Jonson and Marston, are to be reckoned with. See, also, the subsequent paper on *Carlo Buffone*, *ibid.* series x, vol. i, 1904. As to the plays involved in the "war," the plays of Jonson, Marston, and Dekker are referred to their respective eds. in the paragraphs above of this section; *Histriomastix* and *Jack Drum* were reprinted with a sufficient introduction by Simpson in his *School of Shakspere*, 1878; and *The Return from Parnassus* may be consulted in the ed. of the trilogy to which it belongs, by W. D. Macray, 1886; in E. Arber's ed. of *The Return from Parnassus*, 1879; or in the ed. by O. Smeaton, *Temple Dramatists*, 1905. As to *Troilus and Cressida*, see above, section viii of this Essay.

## XI. LONDON LIFE AND THE COMEDY OF MANNERS

**The comedy of manners**, more or less indefinitely distinguished, finds place in all books treating of Elizabethan drama. It seems nowhere to have been specifically discussed. On the order of the comedies, *Westward*, *Eastward*, and *Northward Hoe*, see E. E. Stoll, *John Webster*, 1905. As to a relation between certain characters of Jonson and Dekker, see the same writer, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xx, 1906. The second of these plays has been edited with the *Alchemist* by the present writer, *Belles Lettres Series*, 1903.

The Works of **Thomas Middleton** were first collected by A. Dyce, 5 vols., 1840. The standard ed. is now that of

A. H. Bullen, 8 vols., 1885. It has an excellent Introduction. *The Best Plays of Middleton* were edited in 2 vols. for the *Mermaid Series*, by H. Ellis, with an Introduction by A. C. Swinburne, 1887, who also contributed in the previous year an essay on the same topic to the *Nineteenth Century Review*, xix. C. H. Herford contributes the article on Middleton to the *D. N. B.* xxxvii, 1894; and Fleay treats Middleton in conjunction with William Rowley in his *Biographical Chronicle*, 1891. The best paper on the relations of *The Middleton-Rowley Plays* is the "Inquiry" of P. G. Wiggin, *Radcliffe College Monographs*, xx, 1897. There is also a paper on Middleton by J. Arnheim in *Archiv*, lxxviii, 1887. E. C. Morris writes "On *The Old Law*," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xvii, 1902; E. Baxmann on *The Widow* and Boccaccio, Halle Diss. 1904; H. Jung, on "Das Verhältnis T. Middletons zu Shakespeare," *Beiträge zur romanischen und englischen Philologie*, xxix, 1904. For Middleton's *Game at Chess*, see above, section ix of this Essay; for the relations of his *Witch* to *Macbeth*, section vii. Some of Middleton's civic pageants appear in the *Percy Society's Publ.* x, 1843; all are reprinted by Bullen.

The best account of **Nathaniel Field** is that of J. Knight in *D. N. B.* xviii, 1889. Collier reprinted Field's *Woman is a Weathercock* and *Amends for Ladies*, Dodsley, ed. Hazlitt, xi; and both appear in the volume of the *Mermaid Series* entitled *Nero and Other Plays*, edited by A. W. Verity, 1888. See, also, F. G. Fleay, *Engl. Stud.* xiii, 1889, for some further matter as to Field.

The first **collective ed. of Beaumont and Fletcher** is the folio of 1647; a second folio followed in 1679; an anonymous reprint in 1711. In 1750 appeared the earliest critical ed., by Seward and Sympson, working on earlier material of Theobald. Other eds. are those of Weber, 1812; Darley, 1839; and the authoritative work of A. Dyce, 11 vols., 1843–46, new eds. 1854 and 1876. *The Best Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher* appear in the *Mermaid Series*, edited by J. St. L. Strachey, 2 vols., 1887. A *Variorum ed.*

*of Beaumont and Fletcher*, under the general editorship of A. H. Bullen, to be complete in 12 vols., was begun in 1903 and is now in progress; the text, edited by A. Glover, and later by A. R. Waller, to be complete in 11 vols., was begun in 1905, and is also in progress. Aside from their place in works of more general range, for the **bibliography of Beaumont and Fletcher** see that of A. C. Potter, 1890, C. W. Moulton in the *Library of Criticism*, 1901, and A. H. Thorndike in his ed. of "*The Maid's Tragedy* and *Philaster*," *Belles Lettres Series*, 1906.

In addition to the authorities of wider range, the **biography of Beaumont** is treated in the important monograph of G. C. Macaulay, *Francis Beaumont, a Critical Study;* and A. B. Grosart contributes the article on that poet to *D. N. B.* iv, 1885. **The biographical notice of Fletcher** in *D. N. B.* xix, 1889, is by A. H. Bullen. A. C. Swinburne's article on both poets in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1887, reprinted in his *Studies in Prose and Poetry*, 1894, should also be consulted. Earlier **criticism of Beaumont and Fletcher** begins with Dryden. See, especially, *The Grounds of Criticism in Tragedy*, 1679; J. M. Mason, *Comments on the Plays* of both poets, 1797; Coleridge in vol. ii of his *Literary Remains;* and Schlegel and Hazlitt in their lectures, as above. More extensive criticism is contained in the article by W. Spalding, "Beaumont and Fletcher and their Contemporaries," *Edinburgh Review*, lxxiii, 1841; the admirable essay of W. B. Donne, reprinted from *Fraser's Magazine*, 1850, in his *Essays on the Drama*, 1858; and C. C. Clarke in *The Gentleman's Magazine*, n. s. viii, 1871. See, also, the extensive studies of B. Leonhardt, *Die Textvarianten von Philaster, The Maid's Tragedy*, etc., *Anglia*, xix and xxvi, 1896 and 1903, and the same author on *Bonduca*, *Engl. Stud.* xiii, 1889; the exhaustive study of A. H. Thorndike, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 1901; and O. L. Hatcher's excellent *John Fletcher, a Study in Dramatic Method*, Chicago Thesis, 1905. For the question of the authorship of the Beaumont-

Fletcher-Massinger group of plays, see below, section xvii of this Essay.

Among **Fletcherian comedies of manners** the following have received specific treatment: L. Bahlsen, *Eine Comödie Fletchers (Rule a Wife and Have a Wife), ihre spanische Quelle*, 1894; A. S. W. Rosenbach, "The Curious Impertinent in English Dramatic Literature," *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xvii, 1902 (part of a larger study, *Spanish Sources of Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*, as yet unpublished). The sources of *The Spanish Curate* (E. Klein); of *The Honest Man's Fortune* (K. Richter); *M. Thomas* (H. Guskar) and *Women Pleased* (W. Kiepert, *Jahrbuch*, xli) have formed matter of late (1905 and 1906) for German dissertations. As to *M. Thomas*, see, also, Stiefel in *Engl. Stud.* xxxvi, 1906, and O. L. Hatcher in *Anglia*, February, 1907, an excellent paper raising the whole question of the pursuit of "Quellen." For the monographs on Fletcherian tragedies and tragicomedies, as well as the more extended discussions of Spanish sources in the Stuart drama, see section xvii of this Essay below.

## XII. ROMANTIC TRAGEDY

General works on the **æsthetics and technique of tragedy** hardly concern us here. However, aside from the general authorities already named (such as Coleridge, Lamb, Hazlitt, Schlegel, Lessing, and many more), the following may be specified: G. Freytag, *Die Technik des Dramas*, 1863, translation, 1895; P. Fitzgerald, *Principles of Comedy and Dramatic Effect*, 1870; H. Ulrici, *Shakespeare's Dramatic Art*, tr. 1876; R. Prölss, *Katechismus der Dramaturgie*, 1877; M. Souriau, *De la Convention dans la Tragédie Classique et dans le Drame Romantique*, 1885; J. R. Colby, *Some Ethical Aspects of Later Elizabethan Tragedy*, Michigan Thesis, 1886; R. Moulton, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist*, 1889; A. Hennequin, *The Art of Playwriting*, 1891; G. Meredith, *An Essay on Comedy*, 1897;

E. Woodbridge, *The Drama, its Laws and Technique*, 1898; Wm. Cloëtta, "Die Anfänge der Renaissance Tragödie," *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters*, ii, 1902; W. L. Courtney, "Shakespeare's Tragic Sense," *National Review*, 1904; A. C. Bradley, "Hegel's Theory of Tragedy," *Hibbert Journal*, 1904; and his *Shakespearean Tragedy*, 1904. A. H. Thorndike has in preparation a monograph on "The Tragedy" in *Types of English Literature*.

On the **tragedies of revenge,** see in particular the excellent work of A. H. Thorndike, "The Relations of *Hamlet* to Contemporary Revenge Plays," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xvii, 1902. (*The Spanish Tragedy* and the relations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* to the earlier play of Kyd are discussed above, section v of this Essay.) The mooted question of the relations of the two quartos of *Hamlet* is well epitomized in Ward and treated more at length in the *New Variorum Hamlet* of Furness. See, also, the *Clarendon Press Hamlet* of Clark and Wright, Introduction, 1872; and the Introductions to the facsimile eds. of the Quartos, n. d., by F. J. Furnivall, which ought sufficiently to have settled the question of the priority of Quarto A. See, however, the "questionings" of F. P. von Westenholz, *Engl. Stud.* xxxiv, 1904. On the sources of *Hamlet*, see R. G. Latham, *Two Dissertations on the Hamlet of Saxo-Grammaticus and of Shakespeare*, 1872; R. Prölss in *Jahrbuch*, xiv, 1879; R. Gericke and M. Moltke, *Shakespeare's Hamlet-Quellen*, 1881. *The Historie of Hamblet* has been several times reprinted in translation: by Collier in his *Shakespeare's Library*, by Furness, and by O. Elton, *The First Nine Books of the Danish History of Saxo-Grammaticus*, 1894. Into the abounding literature on *Hamlet* it is impossible here to enter. A few more recent books are R. Loening, *Die Hamlet-Tragödie Shakespeares*, 1893; A. H. Tolman, "A View of the Views about *Hamlet*," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xiii, 1898, reprinted in his collected essays of that title, 1903, where will be found mention of many works on this tragedy; A. C. Bradley in *Shakespearean Tragedy*, 1904;

J. C. Collins, "New and Old Lights on Hamlet's Character," *Contemporary Review*, 1905; G. P. Baker, "*Hamlet* on an Elizabethan Stage," *Jahrbuch*, xli, 1905. There is, too, an excellent paper on "The Comic Aspects of Madness in Shakespeare and other Elizabethan Dramatists," by C. A. Weatherby, *Harvard Monthly*, 1897.

As to **Henry Chettle**, see the Introduction to his *Kind-heart's Dream*, by C. M. Ingleby, reprint for the *New Sh. Soc.* 1874; this famous pamphlet was earlier reprinted for the *Percy Society* by E. F. Rimbault, 1841. A. H. Bullen contributes the article on *Chettle* to the *D. N. B.* x, 1887; a complete list of Chettle's plays will be found in the Introduction to the reprint of *Hoffman*, by "H. B. L.," 1852, little changed by R. Ackermann's later ed., 1894. An older essay on *Hoffman and Hamlet* is that of N. Delius, *Jahrbuch*, ix, 1874; on the device of a burning crown used in *Hoffman*, see E. Koeppel in *Archiv*, cix, 1898. The only collected ed. of **Cyril Tourneur** is that of J. C. Collins, 2 vols., 1878. *The Revenger's Tragedy* and *The Atheist's Tragedy* have been reprinted in collections of the drama; most lately in a volume with the two tragedies of Webster, by J. A. Symonds, 1888. G. Goodwin communicated to the *Academy*, May 9, 1891, the little that is known of the life of Tourneur; see, also, *ibid.* March 31, 1894. T. Seccombe contributes the article on Tourneur to the *D. N. B.* lvii, 1899. A discussion of the sources of Tourneur's two tragedies will be found in Koeppel's *Quellen Studien*, i, 1895, "Anhang." The other tragedies of revenge, Kyd's, Chapman's, Webster's, will be found under their authors elsewhere in this essay.

The date of *Romeo and Juliet*, with other plays, is discussed by G. Sarrazin, "Zur Chronologie von Shakespeares Jugend-dramen," *Jahrbuch*, xxix and xxx, 1894. The question of the relations of the two quartos was early discussed by C. J. T. Mommsen in his notable *Romeo and Juliet, eine Kritische Ausgabe des überlieferten Doppeltextes*, 1859; by P. A. Daniel, *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874–75; and

by R. Gericke, *Jahrbuch*, xiv, 1879. See, also, the prefatory matter of H. A. Evans, comparing the quartos reproduced in the facsimile ed. of the quartos of Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*, 1886. The sources and parallels of *Romeo and Juliet* have been incessantly considered. P. A. Daniel reprints two of them in *New Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1875; see K. P. Schulze, N. Delius, A. Cohn, and L. H. Fischer in *Jahrbuch*, xi, xiii, xvi, xxiv, xxv, 1876 to 1890. Earlier bibliography of this tragedy will be found in Furness' *Variorum ed.* up to its date, 1871. In *Engl. Stud.* xix, 1894, L. Fränkel attempted "Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des Stoffes von *Romeo and Juliet;*" W. E. A. Axon discusses the play "before Shakespeare's time," *Trans. of the Royal Society of Literature*, 1905; and H. de W. Fuller, *Mod. Phil.* iv, 1906, treats of the pre-Shakespearean play on this subject in its relations to early German and Dutch versions.

For *Antony and Cleopatra*, see the next section of this Essay; for *Macbeth and Lear*, see above, section vii. *Othello*, for its celebrity, has attracted less comment than others of Shakespeare's plays. The date of this tragedy, its source, and other matters, especially the color of the Moor, are sufficiently elucidated with citation of the authorities in the Furness *Variorum ed.* 1886. No student of the play, however, should neglect the delightful passages in the *Noctes Ambrosianæ* ("Christopher under Canvas," 1850) of J. Wilson on *Othello*. Some monographs not mentioned in the *Variorum* are: E. W. Sievers, *Ueber die Grundidee des Shakspearischen Dramas Othello*, 1851; F. Lüders, *Beiträge zur Erklärung von Shakespeares Othello*, 1863; C. Kohlschein, *A Commentary on Shakespeare's Othello*, 1879; E. Hano, *Some Hints About Shakespeare's Othello*, 1880; T. R. Price, *The Construction of Verse in Othello*, 1888; W. R. Turnbull, *Othello, a Critical Study*, 1892. Above all see A. C. Bradley, *Shakespearean Tragedy*, as above, for much illuminating appreciation of *Othello*.

As to the general Elizabethan treatment of the supernatural, see section vii above. The ghost in Elizabethan

**drama** has recently attracted renewed attention. See H. Ankenbrand, "Die Figur des Geistes im Drama der englischen Renaissance," *Münchener Beiträge*, xxxv, 1906; the two excellent papers of F. W. Moorman, "The Pre-Shakespearean Ghost," and "Shakespeare's Ghosts," both in the *Modern Language Review*, also 1906; and E. E. Stoll, who maintains with zeal "The Objectivity of the Ghosts in Shakspere," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xxii, 1907. Earlier contributions to the subjects are E. Roffe, *Ghost Belief in Shakespeare*, 1851; and J. H. Hudson, "Shakespeare's Ghosts," *Westminster Review*, cliii, 1900; M. F. Egan contributes a paper on "The Ghost in *Hamlet*" to *The Catholic University Bulletin*, 1901. Bradley should be consulted, too, on this topic. *Titus Andronicus*, *Lust's Dominion*, and *Women Beware Women* have been treated above, sections v and ix of this Essay; the "Authorship and Date of *The Insatiate Countess*" are discussed by R. A. Small, *Harvard Studies*, v, 1896.

*The Dramatic Works of* **John Webster** were first collected by A. Dyce, 4 vols., 1830; another complete ed. is that of W. Hazlitt, also 4 vols., 1857. Aside from the earlier anonymous paper on Webster in the *Retrospective Review*, x, 1823, E. Gosse devotes an essay to that dramatist in his *Seventeenth Century Essays*, 1883, new ed. 1897; A. C. Swinburne writes with his usual brilliancy of Webster in the *Nineteenth Century*, xix, 1886, reprinted in *Studies in Prose and Poetry*, 1894; and W. Archer writes on "Webster, Lamb, and Swinburne," *New Review*, vii, 1893. C. Kingsley also paid his respects to Webster in *Plays and Puritans*, 1859. The article on *Webster* in *D. N. B.* lx, 1899, is by S. Lee, the editor. There are likewise a Diss. by C. Volpel on *Webster* (Bremen), 1888; "Metrische Untersuchungen über den Dramatiker, John Webster," by A. F. von Schack in his *Die englischen Dramatiker vor, neben und nach Shakespeare*, 1893; and the article of W. von Wurzbach in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 1898.

The two great **tragedies of Webster** have been frequently

reprinted, most recently in the *Mermaid Series*, with Tourneur, by J. A. Symonds, 1888; and in the *Belles Lettres Series*, 1904, by M. W. Sampson. The latter contains an excellent bibliography. *The White Devil* has apparently not been separately reprinted. *The Duchess of Malfi* appears in the *Temple Dramatists*, 1896, edited by C. Vaughan, and is promised as a Yale Thesis by E. W. Manwaring. German considerations of these tragedies are those of F. von Bodenstedt in his *Shakespeares Zeitgenossen und ihre Werke*, 1858–60, where *The Duchess of Malfi* is translated; and R. Prölss, *Altenglisches Theater*, n. d., where *The White Devil* appears. See, also, W. W. Greg, "Webster's *White Devil*," *Modern Language Quarterly*, iii, 1900; and C. Crawford, "Webster and Sir Philip Sidney," and "Webster's relations to Montaigne, Marston, and others," *Notes and Queries*, series x, vols. ii, and iv, 1904. The wider relations of the two stories are considered by K. Kiesow, "Die verschiedenen Bearbeitungen der Novelle von der Herzogin von Amalfi," *Anglia*, xvii, 1895; and M. Landau, "Vittoria Accorambona in der Dichtung im Verhältnis zu ihrer wahren Geschichte," *Euphorion*, ix, 1902. See, also, a study of Vittoria by E. M. Cesaresco, *Lombard Studies*, the same year. For *Appius and Virginia*, see the next section of this Essay. The serious plot of *A Cure for a Cuckold* was abstracted from its baser contact by S. Spring-Rice in 1885, and published, with an Introduction by E. Gosse, under the innocuous title "*Love's Graduate*." The most recent considerable contribution to the study of Webster is the exhaustive and painstaking Munich Thesis of E. E. Stoll expanded, *John Webster, the Periods of his Work as determined by his Relations to the Drama of his Day*, 1905. See, also, an essay on Webster, by J. Morris, *Fortnightly Review*, lxxi, 1902; and L. J. Sturge, "Webster and the Law," *Jahrbuch*, xlii, 1906.

Among the more important tragedies not already mentioned in this section, the divided authorship of *The Changeling* is best considered by Miss Wiggin in *The Middleton-*

*Rowley Plays*, 1897; *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* is preceded by a sufficient note in Dodsley, x, where it is reprinted; on the underplot, see A. S. W. Rosenbach on "The Curious Impertinent," in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xvii, 1902. For the latest word on *The Maid's Tragedy*, see the ed. of A. H. Thorndike, *Belles Lettres Series*, 1907, which is furnished with an excellent bibliography. *The Unnatural Combat* of Massinger, edited from the early eds. with an Introduction on the Cenci story in English literature, the work of C. Stratton, is an unpublished Pennsylvania Thesis, 1904.

## XIII. HISTORY AND TRAGEDY ON CLASSICAL MYTH AND STORY

On the early **influence of Euripides** in the dramas of Western Europe, see the general histories of literature and the drama; on this influence and other early classical influences, see, also, Herford, as above, and A. Brandl, *Quellen des Weltlichen Dramas*, 1898, *passim*, and the authorities cited in section v of this Essay above. See, also, W. Bang and H. de Vocht, "Klassiker und Humanisten als Quellen älterer Dramatiker," *Engl. Stud.* xxxvi, 1906; and the several authorities on the classical drama in Italy cited by Cunliffe in his ed. of Gascoigne's plays, *Belles Lettres Series*, 1906.

The important **influence of Seneca** is specifically treated by J. W. Cunliffe, *The Influence of Seneca on Elizabethan Tragedy*, Manchester Diss.; and by R. Fischer, *Zur Kunstentwicklung der englischen Tragödie von ihren ersten Anfängen bis zu Shakespeare*. Both of these works appeared in 1893. On this and kindred subjects, see, too, D. Hannay, "The Later Renaissance," 1898. The titles of many plays on classical subjects will be found in the *Revels' Accounts*, *Old Sh. Soc.* 1842. *The Ten Tragedies of Seneca*, translated by various hands and collected by Thomas Newton in 1581, are reprinted by the Spenser Society, 2 vols., 1887. *Queen Elizabeth's Englishings*, which include a fragment

of the *Hercules Œtæus*, are reprinted by E. Flügel in *Anglia*, x, 1888.

On **the influence of Seneca in French dilution**, see the valuable unpublished thesis of J. A. Lester, *Connections between the Drama of France and Great Britain, particularly in the Elizabethan Period*, Harvard Library, 1902. Much of the material therein which is applicable to the discussions of this book is excerpted by M. W. Croll, *The Works of Fulke Greville*, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1903. See, also, the suggestive note of G. Saintsbury prefixed to vol. iii of A. B. Grosart's ed. of *Samuel Daniel*, 1883–96; and for the wider relations of the topic, J. W. Cunliffe, "Early French Tragedy in the Light of Recent Scholarship," *Journal of Comparative Literature*, i, 1903, and the incidental references. The kindred work of the same writer should also be consulted, *The Influence of Seneca*, 1893, as above; and "The Influence of Italian on Early Elizabethan Drama," *Mod. Phil.* iv, 1906. Among Elizabethan English plays influenced by French Seneca, Kyd's *Cornelia* has been specifically edited by H. Gassner, 1894, the Countess of Pembroke's *Antonie* has been reprinted by A. Luce, *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, iii, 1897; Lady Carew's *Mariam* and the later *Herod and Antipater* have not been reprinted. The authoritative ed. of **Samuel Daniel** is that of A. B. Grosart, *Huth Library*, 5 vols., 1883–96. The article on Daniel in *D. N. B.* xiv, 1886, is by the editor, S. Lee. See the series of notes on Daniel and Florio, by B. Corney, in *Notes and Queries*, series iii, vol. viii, 1865, and a contribution by Fleay in *Anglia*, xi, 1889. Grosart has likewise edited the Works of **Fulke Greville, Lord Brooke,** in *The Fuller Worthies' Library*, 4 vols., 1870. The first collective ed. of Greville was printed after his death, in 1633, and contains both his extant tragedies. The most recent consideration of this poet is that of M. W. Croll in his excellent monograph, *The Works of Fulke Greville*, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1903. S. Lee likewise contributes an article on Greville to the *D. N. B.* xxiii, 1890. The Poeti-

cal Works of **William Alexander, Earl of Stirling,** comprising the *Monarchic Tragedies,* were reprinted anonymously, Glasgow, 3 vols., 1870. C. Rogers, *Memorials of the Earl of Stirling,* 2 vols., 1877, forms the basis of the study, *Sir William Alexander, Graf von Stirling als Dramatiker,* by H. Beumelberg, 1880, as of A. B. Grosart's article in *D. N. B.* i, 1885. J. Engel writes "Ueber die Spuren Senecas in Shakespeares Dramen," in *Preussische Jahrbücher,* April, 1903.

Of the **early Elizabethan dramas on classical subjects,** *Horestes* and *Darius* have been reprinted by A. Brandl in his *Quellen des Weltlichen Dramas,* 1898; *The Wars of Cyrus* appears, with prefatory matter by W. Keller, in *Jahrbuch,* xxxvii, 1901; *Die Geschichte von Appius und Virginia* was considered by O. Rumbaur, Breslau Diss. 1890; and Webster's tragedy on that theme by J. Lauschke, Leipzig Diss. 1899. Lodge's *Wounds of Civil Wars* is reprinted in Dodsley, vii. For a separate discussion of Marlowe's *Dido,* see above, section v of this Essay. On the *Dido* plays in general literature, see J. Friedrich, *Dido-Dramen,* 1888, as above. For Lodge and Marlowe and their other work, see section v of this Essay above. *The Golden, Silver, Brazen,* and *Iron Ages* of Heywood with his *Lucrece* are discussed by Fleay, i, 1891.

The general source of **Shakespeare's dramas on classical subjects,** *Plutarch's Lives of the Noble Grecians and Romans,* 1579, Englished by Sir Thomas North, is best studied in the ed. of G. Wyndham, *Tudor Translations,* 6 vols., 1895–96. See, also, R. C. Trench, *Plutarch, Five Lectures,* 2d ed. 1874; W. W. Skeat's convenient little volume, *Shakespeare's Plutarch,* 1875; and F. L. Leo, *Four Chapters of North's Plutarch,* 1878, both of which latter contain excellent introductions on the poet's use of his sources. R. Sigismund, "Uebereinstimmendes in Shakespeare und Plutarch," *Jahrbuch,* xviii, 1883, should also be consulted.

On the general subject of **the classical learning of**

**Shakespeare,** see the famous essay of R. Farmer, 1767; A. Büchler, *Shakespeares Dramen in ihrem Verhältnisse zur griechischen Tragödie*, 1856; F. W. Farrar, *The Influence of the Revival of Classical Studies on English Literature during the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I* (Le Bas Prize), 1856; G. Stapfer, *Shakespeare et l'Antiquité*, 1879; T. S. Baynes, "What Shakespeare learnt at School," *Frazer's Magazine*, xx and xxi, 1879–80; reprinted in *Shakespeare Studies*, 1894; N. Delius, "Klassische Reminiscenzen in Shakespeare's Dramen," *Jahrbuch*, xviii, 1883; F. Brincker, *Poetik Shakespeares in den Römer Dramen*, 1884; R. Genée, *Klassische Frauenbilder aus dramatischen Dichtungen von Shakespeare*, 1884. The whole controversy is well summed up, and a conclusion the reverse of Farmer's substantiated, by J. C. Collins, "Shakespeare as a Classical Scholar," *Studies in Shakespeare*, 1904.

The only one of the non-Shakespearean **plays on Julius Caesar** which has attracted specific attention is Chapman's *Cæsar and Pompey*, the inevitable study of the sources of which is made by A. Kern, Halle Diss. 1901. The anonymous *Cæsar's Revenge* remains unedited; the two Latin manuscript plays, unpublished. One of the earliest works to give special attention to Shakespeare's *Julius Cæsar* is G. L. Craik's *The English of Shakespeare illustrated in his Julius Cæsar*, 1856; 4th ed. 1869. N. Delius considers the sources in Plutarch, *Jahrbuch*, xvii, 1882; Fleay assumes that the tragedy is a compound of what once formed two plays, see his *Life of Shakespeare*, 1886; and A. W. Verity in the Pitt Press ed. of *Julius Cæsar*, 1895, Introduction, fixes the date by the allusions to *Hamlet*. But see G. Sarrazin, "Die Abfassungszeit von *Julius Cæsar*," in *Anglia*, Beiblatt, xiv, 1892. See, also, R. Prölss, *Julius Cæsar erläutert*, 1875; P. Kreutzberg, *Brutus in Shakespeare's Julius Cæsar*, 1894. P. Trabaud is one of many foreign writers on the topic, *Etude comparative sur le Julius Cæsar de Shakespeare et le même sujet par Voltaire*, 1889.

A sufficient résumé of the whole topic, as of the other "classical" plays of Shakespeare, will be found in Ward. T. Vatke long since definitively considered "Shakespeares Antonius und Kleopatra und Plutarch's Biographie des Antonius," *Jahrbuch*, iii, 1868; F. Adler treats the same topic in the same, xxxi, 1895. On the larger relations of the story of Cleopatra, see G. H. Moeller, *Die Auffassung der Kleopatra in der Tragödienlitteratur*, 1888. See, also, J. L. Etty, "Studies in Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*," *Macmillan's Magazine*, 1904. For further bibliography and the æsthetic criticism of this play the reader is referred to the admirable *Variorum ed.* of H. H. Furness, 1907. *Coriolanus* was enthusiastically appraised by H. Viehoff, "Shakespeare's Coriolan," *Jahrbuch*, iv, 1869. See, also, the admirable essay of N. Delius, "Shakespeare's Coriolanus in seinem Verhältniss zum Coriolanus des Plutarchs," the same, xi, 1876. On the date, see Halliwell-Phillipps, *Selected Notes upon Shakespeare's Coriolanus*, etc., 1868; and F. J. Furnivall's reply in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874. There is likewise F. A. Leo, *Shakespeares Coriolanus beleuchtet*, 1861, and F. von Westenholz, *Die Tragik in Shakespeares Coriolanus*, 1895. See, also, E. Crosby, *Shakespeare's Attitude towards the Working Classes*, 1904, and R. Büttner, "Zu Coriolan und seinen Quellen," *Jahrbuch*, xli, 1906. The authorship of *Timon of Athens* and the degree of Shakespeare's part in it has attracted much attention. See, especially, articles of N. Delius, of B. Tschischwitz, of W. Wendlandt, and H. Conrad in *Jahrbuch*, ii, iv, xxiii, and xxix, 1867–94, maintaining various views; and the paper of Fleay, "On the Authorship of *Timon*," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874. The bibliographical relations of *Timon*, as of *Pericles*, are well considered in S. Lee's Introduction to the facsimile reproductions of the first Shakespeare folio, 1902. The academic *Timon* of 1600 was reprinted by A. Dyce for the *Old Sh. Soc.* 1842. A. Müller conducts the inquiry into the *Quellen aus denen Shakespeare den Timon entnommen hat*, 1873. The older idea that this play is un-

related to Shakespeare's is combated by W. H. Clemons in *Princeton University Bulletin*, xv, 1904. See, also, A. Fresenius, *Timon auf der Bühne*, 1895. The starting-point of a study of *Pericles* is the able essay of N. Delius in *Jahrbuch*, iii, 1868; in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874, Fleay applied the new verse tests with success to the problem of the authorship of this play; while R. Boyle, in the same, 1882, inquired into Wilkins' share in the drama. An exhaustive inquiry into *Shakespeare's Pericles and Apollonius of Tyre* in its various versions is that of the late A. H. Smyth, 1898. For the bibliography of *Cymbeline* and *Troilus and Cressida*, see, respectively, sections viii and xvii of this Essay.

Aside from the discussion which the Roman plays of Jonson receive in all complete editions of the dramatist, see H. Saegelken, *Ben Jonson's Römer-Dramen*, 1880. *Sejanus* has been separately edited by C. Sachs, Leipzig, 1862. On various versions of this subject and other matters, see J. Bolte, "Ben Jonson's *Sejanus* am Heidelberger Hofe," *Jahrbuch*, xxiv, 1889. *Catiline* was separately edited with special reference to its sources by A. L. Wright, Yale Thesis, 1901; a consideration of the same tragedy in the same respect characterizes the Halle Diss. of A. Vogt, 1903. Both of Jonson's tragedies are promised, edited by W. D. Briggs, in the *Belles Lettres Series*. The fine anonymous play of *Nero*, 1624, was reprinted by Bullen in his *Old English Plays*, 1882; it was edited again by H. P. Horne for the *Mermaid Dramatists*, 1888. Heywood's *Rape of Lucrece* was anonymously edited in 1824.

On the story of Marston's *The Wonder of Women*, in its wider relations, see A. Andrae, *Sophonisbe in der französischen Tragödie mit Berücksichtigung der Sophonisbebearbeitungen in anderen Litteraturen*, 1891; on the relations of Fletcher's *False One*, G. H. Moeller, *Die Auffassung der Kleopatra in der Tragödienliteratur*, 1888; on those of Markham's *Herod and Antipater*, M. Landau, "Die Dramen von Herod und Mariamne," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, viii and ix, 1895–96. M. Oefte-

rung considers "Heliodor und seine Bedeutung für die Litteraturgeschichte," *Litterarhistorische Forschungen*, xviii, 1901; *The Roman Actor* of Massinger, edited by F. P. Emery, is promised in the *Belles Lettres Series*.

The Roman plays of **Thomas May** and Nathaniel Richards have not been reprinted; for May, see the notice of him in *D. N. B.* xxxvii, 1894, by C. H. Firth, and the authorities therein cited. T. Seccombe supplies to the same, xlviii, the notice of **Nathaniel Richards**, whose *Messalina*, described by Genest, vol. x, has not been reprinted.

## XIV. COLLEGE DRAMA

**The college drama** as such seems not to have been treated in its completeness. The **material** for a reconstruction of this chapter of the academic past is scattered among records which are happily becoming more and more accessible to the general reader. Among the many works on the English universities the following may be here mentioned: H. C. M. Lyte, *A History of the University of Oxford to the year* 1530, 1886; C. Plummer, *Elizabethan Oxford*, 1887; C. W. Boase, *Register of the University of Oxford*, 1885; F. Fuller, *The History of the University of Cambridge to the year* 1634, ed. M. Prickett and F. Wright, 1840; J. B. Mullinger, *A History of Cambridge, Epochs of Church History*, 1886. Other works are R. Masters, *The History of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge*, 1753; and H. C. M. Lyte, *A History of Eton College*, new ed. 1889. Both of J. Nichols' works, *The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, 3 vols., new ed. 1823, and *The Progresses of King James*, 4 vols., 1828, contain much valuable material concerning the royal visits to the universities. For other matter, see Plummer, *Elizabethan Oxford*, as above; the interesting paper in *Miscellanea Antiqua Anglicana*, i, 1816; a popular account of the same, "Thalia in Oxford," by the present author, *The Queen's Progress*, 1904.

An excellent **account of the Latin plays** acted before the

University of Cambridge is that of an anonymous writer in *The Retrospective Review*, xii, 1825; a less complete though meritorious account of academic plays at Oxford is contained in the Introduction to *Narcissus, a Twelfth Night Merriment*, 1602, edited by M. L. Lee, 1893. A valuable descriptive list of Latin university plays is that of G. W. Churchill and W. Keller, "Die lateinischen Universitäts-Dramen Englands," *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 1898. For the earlier school drama at the universities, see Herford, *Literary Relations*, as above; M. W. Wallace, in the Introduction to his reprint of *The Birthe of Hercules*, 1903, discusses Plautus and Terence in earlier English drama. For other works on this topic, see section x of this Essay, above; for a list of pre-Elizabethan academic plays, see Chambers' *Mediæval Stage*, 2 vols., 1903, Appendix E. For the later controversy of Gager and Rainholds, see the notices of these two men by S. Lee, *D. N. B.* vols. xx and xlvii; and E. N. S. Thompson, *The Controversy between the Puritans and the Stage*, Yale Thesis, 1903. An excellent account of the performance of several plays before the queen, 1566, is abstracted from a contemporary recital by W. Y. Durand in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xx, 1905.

Aside from the discussion of the Parnassus plays that belongs to works of wider scope and those concerned in a consideration of "the wars of the theaters," the three plays were well edited by W. D. Macray, 1886. *The Return from Parnassus*, besides publication in Hawkins and Dodsley, was reprinted by E. Arber in his *Scholar's Library*, 1878; and recently by O. Smeaton, *Temple Dramatists*, 1905, with an excellent Introduction. An older contribution to the question of the authorship of this play is that of B. Corney in *Notes and Queries*, series iii, vol. ix, 1866. See, also, I. Gollancz, in his communication to Ward on the subject (vol. ii, p. 641 of the latter's *History of Dramatic Literature*, 1899); and W. Lühr, *Die drei Cambridger Spiele vom Parnassus in ihren litterarischen Beziehungen*, Diss. Kiel, 1900.

For the **biographical particulars of the academic dramatists**, see, in general, A. a Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses*, ed. Bliss, 4 vols., 1813–20, and C. H. and F. Cooper, *Athenæ Cantabrigienses*, 1858. T. Fuller, *Worthies of England*, ed. 1840, 3 vols., contains scattered information, and works such as John Aubrey's *Brief Lives*, ed. A. Clark, 2 vols., 1898; and Langbaine, with the later dictionaries, and J. Genest, *Some Account of the English Stage*, 10 vols., 1832, should be consulted. Nearly all the authors of academic plays, usually from their importance in other walks of life, find their place in the *D. N. B.*, where further authorities are cited under each notice. On Wingfield and Forsett, see the Introduction to G. C. Moore Smith's ed. of *Pedantius*, 1905; on George Ruggle, the elaborate memoir prefixed to the ed. of his *Ignoramus* by J. S. Hawkins, 1787; the notice in *D. N. B.* vol. xlix, 1897, by S. Lee; and likewise the Diss. of J. L. Van Gundy on this play, 1905. As to *Lingua*, see Fleay, ii; and his article in *Shakespeariana*, March, 1885. B. Dobell adds some interesting particulars as to Alabaster in *Athenæum*, December 26, 1903; J. Hackett is treated by J. Ware in his *Writers of Ireland*, 1746; S. Brooke and Matthew Gwinne are subjects of J. Ward in his *Lives of the Professors of Gresham College*, 1740; and an account of the Jesuit William Drury is to be found in C. Dodd's *Church History of England*, 1737, vol. ii.

The Poetical and Dramatic Works of **Thomas Randolph** were carelessly edited by W. C. Hazlitt, 2 vols., 1875, with a perfunctory introduction. The most recent biography of Randolph is that of S. Lee, *D. N. B.* xlvii, 1896. See, also, the extravagant article on Randolph and his poetry in the *Retrospective Review*, vi, 1822. The best word on *Amyntas* is that of W. W. Greg in his recent *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama*, 1906, for which see below, section xvi.

Among academic plays, Latin and English, not already mentioned, which have been specifically edited, the following may be named: *Acolastus*, by J. Bolte, *Lateinische Litteraturdenkmäler*, 1891; see the same editor's note on

"Die Oxforder Tragödie Thibaldus," *Jahrbuch*, xxxvii, 1901; *Pedantius* and *Victoria*, both by G. C. Moore Smith, *Materialien zur Kunde*, 1905 and 1906. *The Poetical Works of William Strode* have recently been collected, including *The Floating Island*, 1907. An interesting Introduction precedes the text. There is also an unpublished Pennsylvania Thesis on this play by E. Hoffsten, 1903. T. Odinga describes Vincent's *Paria* in *Engl. Stud.* xvi, 1892.

## XV. THE ENGLISH MASQUE

The completest monograph on the English masque is "Die englischen Maskenspiele," by R. Brotanek, *Wiener Beiträge*, 1902, which contains a reprint of some of the early work of Lydgate and a masque given at Coleoverton, possibly Jonson's. But the earlier monograph of the same title, a Halle Diss., 1882, by A. Soergel, is by no means a bad piece of work, and contains a rough list of masques, the basis of the work of both Evans and Brotanek. *English Masques*, by H. A. Evans, 1897, is a popular reprint of sixteen conspicuous masques prefaced by an essay on the subject, largely based on Soergel. A collection of specimens of the masque, edited by J. C. Adams, is promised among the forthcoming volumes of the *Belles Lettres Series*. J. W. Cunliffe is said, too, to have in preparation a monograph on the masque as a *genre* in *Types of English Literature*. Nichols, in his two great works, *The Progresses of Queen Elizabeth*, 2d ed. 1823, and his *Progresses of King James*, 1828, reprints many rare masques, besides much other valuable contemporary material. Besides the general works of the various writers of masques mentioned in this chapter, the volume of the *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* containing the Life of Inigo Jones, 1848, should be consulted for several reproductions of sketches by Jones (all relating to masques, and none of them to Shakespeare, as once erroneously supposed), and also for reprints of several anonymous masques. The latest bibliography of The English masque is that of

W. W. Greg, *A List of Masques, Pageants, etc.*, Bibliographical Society, London, 1902; Mr. Fleay's List, *Biographical Chronicle*, 1891, contains only anonymous productions of which only a small number are true masques; those by known authors must be sought in that volume under their authors' names. Lastly, F. W. Fairholt, in his *Lord Mayors' Pageants* (*Percy's Society's Publ.* 1843), gives a list (not quite complete) of these productions with an account of them, and reprints several specimens.

For the earlier history of the forerunners of the masque many notices will be found scattered through the *Chronicles* of Hall and Holinshed, and in that mine of contemporary information, social as well as historical, *The Calendar of State Papers*. See, also, *Archæologica*, xxxi, 1858, for earlier material, and E. P. Hammond, "Lydgate's Mumming at Hertford," *Anglia*, xxii, 1899. W. Dugdale's *Origines Juridiciales*, 2d ed. 1671; A. J. Kempe's *Loseley Manuscripts*, 1836; and especially P. Cunningham's "Extracts from the Revels' Accounts," *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1842, likewise afford much valuable material. Collier's work, here as elsewhere, is to be followed with circumspection; though many interesting details have been gleaned by him and garnered in his *History of the Stage*, 3 vols., 1838, new ed. also 3 vols., 1879. An unpublished Yale Thesis, 1904, that of J. C. Adams, *The Predecessors of the Seventeenth Century Court Masque in England*, is quoted with approval by J. W. Cunliffe, whose own "Italian Prototypes of the Masque and Dumb Show," *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xxii, 1907, should also be consulted.

As to texts of the masques, aside from Evans and the forthcoming collection of Adams, the *Gesta Grayorum* will be found in Nichols' *Elizabeth;* Daniel's masques in Grosart's ed. of that poet, *Huth Library*, 5 vols., 1883–96; *The Works of Doctor* Thomas Campion, including his masques, are edited by A. H. Bullen, 1889; the Lords' Masque of Chapman, and Beaumont's and Campion's, written for the same occasion, are reprinted in Nichols,

*James.* (See, besides his information on these events, a note of F. Marx, "Bericht eines zeitgenossischen Deutschen über die Aufführung von Chapman's Mask," etc., *Jahrbuch*, xxix-xxx, 1894. The masques of Middleton, and his *City Pageants* as well, are contained in Bullen's ed. of that dramatist, 8 vols., 1885. The masque of **William Browne** appears in W. C. Hazlitt's ed. of *The Poetry of Browne*, 1868; as in that of G. Goodwin, *The Muses Library*, 1893. **Jonson's masques** are reprinted in the collective eds. of his works; see, especially, Cunningham-Gifford, *Works of Jonson*, 9 vols., 1871 and 1875, where a sufficient account of each is prefixed. (For certain corrections, see, however, the list of Brotanek, as above.) See, also, I. Schmidt, "Ueber Ben Jonson's Maskenspiele," *Archiv*, xxvii, 1860; and J. Hofmiller, *Die ersten sechs Masken Ben Jonsons in ihrem Verhältniss zur antiken Literatur*, 1902.

On the "Influence of Court Masques on the Drama," see A. H. Thorndike in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* n. s. viii, 1900. On the wider related topic, H. Schwab, *Das Schauspiel im Schauspiel*, 1896, and W. J. Lawrence, "Plays within Plays," *Engl. Stud.* xxxiii, 1904. See, also, Littledale, ed. of *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1876, for some remarks on the masque contained in that play.

Among **later Stuart masques**, that of **Thomas Carew** is reprinted by J. W. Ebsworth in his ed. of Carew's Poetry, 1893; the masques of **Sir William Davenant** form part of the collective ed. of his works by Logan and Maidment, 5 vols., 1872–74. Brotanek assigns to Davenant a masque entitled *Luminalia* (reprinted by A. B. Grosart in his *Fuller Worthies' Library*, 1872–73, vol. iv): "Ein unerkanntes Werk Sir William Davenants," *Anglia*, Beiblatt, xi, 1900; and reprints with W. Bang, in *Materialien zur Kunde*, 1903, *The King's and Queen's Entertainment at Richmond.* On "The Temple of Love," see W. Ebert in *Jahrbuch*, xli, 1905. The masques and like productions of **James Shirley** will be found in the collective ed. of his works

by A. Dyce, 6 vols., 1833. See, also, a paper by O. Ritter on Shirley's "Amor und Tod," *Engl. Stud.* xxxii, 1903.

**Milton and the masque** with his *Arcades* and *Comus* are best discussed in all their possible relations in D. Masson's monumental *Life of Milton*, 6 vols., 1859–80; new ed. 1881. The article on Milton in *D. N. B.* xxxviii, 1894, is by S. Lee, the editor, and the added note contains an excellent brief bibliography. The standard biography of Milton, prior to Masson, was that of J. Mitford, prefixed to his ed. of the *Works of Milton*, 1851. See, also, A. Stern, *Milton und seine Zeit*, 1877–79; excellent short biographies are those of M. Pattison in *English Men of Letters*, 1879; and R. Garnett in *Great Writers*, 1890. To the latter is appended an admirable bibliography. Editions and critical articles are too numerous to cite here. An excellent ed. of *Comus*, the introduction of which contains much valuable critical material, is that of A. W. Verity, 1891. A valuable recent ed. of *The Lyric and Dramatic Poems* is that of M. W. Sampson, 1901.

## XVI. THE PASTORAL DRAMA

The authoritative work on **the English pastoral** is now that of W. W. Greg, *Pastoral Poetry and Pastoral Drama, a Literary Inquiry with Special Reference to the Pre-Restoration Stage in England*, 1906. Appended will be found an excellent bibliography. An earlier essay by the same author, "The Pastoral Drama on the Elizabethan Stage," was contributed to the *Cornhill Magazine*, n. s. vii, 1899. On the general topic, see E. W. Gosse, *An Essay on English Pastoral Poetry*, and A. B. Grosart, *Rider on Mr. Gosse's Essay*, the latter's ed. of *Spenser*, vol. iii, 1882. H. O. Sommer, *Erster Versuch über die englische Hirtendichtung*, 1888, is concerned with the eclogue, little with the drama. Of similar limitations is *Die englische Hirtendichtung von* 1579–1625, by K. Windscheid, 1895. E. K. Chambers, *English Pastorals*, 1895, and C. H. Herford's ed. of *The*

*Shepherds' Calendar* are both furnished with excellent Introductions on the general theme. "Pastoral Influence in the English Drama" seems first to have been investigated as such by Homer Smith, Pennsylvania Thesis, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* 1897. A. H. Thorndike discusses "The Pastoral Element in the English Drama before 1605" in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xiv, 1900; and J. Laidler writes "A History of Pastoral Drama in England," *Engl. Stud.* xxxv, 1905, in peculiar unacquaintance with previous work on the subject, though none the less describing several out-of-the-way pastoral dramas.

**The pastoral idea** and "the feeling for Nature" has been the theme of innumerable essays; among them may be mentioned: A. Lang, *Theocritus, Bion, and Moschus rendered into English Prose*, 1889; the Introduction contains an excellent account of Alexandrine poetry. The monograph of F. W. Moorman, on "William Browne and the Pastoral Poetry of the Elizabethan Age," in *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxxi, 1897, contains a valuable "Essay on the Interpretation of Nature from Chaucer to Bacon." Two recent unpublished contributions to the topic are H. A. Eaton, *The Pastoral Idea in English Poetry in the Sixteenth Century*, Harvard Thesis; and *The Feeling for Nature in English Pastoral Poetry*, by J. I. Bryan, Pennsylvania Thesis, both 1907.

For the **authorities on the Italian pastoral** the reader must be referred to Greg's *Pastoral Poetry*, as above. The earlier chapters contain an admirable account of the subject. See, also, J. A. Symonds, *Renaissance in Italy*, 1897–98; the histories of Italian literature of Weise and Percopo, 1899; and of D'Ancona and Bacci, 1897–1900, noted above; and A. D'Ancona, *Origini del Teatro Italiano*, 2 vols., 1877, new ed. 1891; for a briefer résumé, see R. Garnett, *A History of Italian Literature*, 1898. The authoritative work on the *Arcadia* of Sannazaro is that of M. Scherillo, 1888; on his younger rival, see V. Rossi, *Battista Guarini ed Il Pastor Fido*, 1886; on Tasso, G. Carducci, *Su l' Aminta*

*di T. Tasso*, 1899. On the translation of Tasso into English, including the *Aminta*, see E. Koeppel in *Anglia*, xi, 1889. A Latin version of *Il Pastor Fido* is described in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 1898. As to Spanish influences, see J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, *A History of Spanish Literature*, 1898; on "The Spanish Pastoral Romance," H. A. Rennert in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* vii, 1892.

**Texts and descriptions of pastoral entertainments,** among them Sidney's *Lady of May*, are to be found in Nichols' *Elizabeth;* the pastorals, like the dramas of Peele and Lyly, are included in all eds. of their works. The attempt of L. L. Schücking, *Die stofflichen Beziehungen der englischen Komödie zur italienischen bis Lilly*, 1901, has been discredited as to pastoral as well as most other influences, by Bond, in his ed. of the latter poet, 1902. For *Mucedorus*, Munday's two chronicle histories on the Earl of Huntington (Robin Hood), and *As You Like It*, see sections vi and viii above, of this Essay. A. H. Thorndike discusses the relation of the last play named to the Robin Hood plays in the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iv, 1902. The two **pastoral plays of Samuel Daniel** are included in the collective ed. of his works, by A. B. Grosart, *Huth Library*, 5 vols., 1883–96. See, as to *Hymen's Triumph*, W. W. Greg, *Mod. Lang. Quarterly*, vi, 1903. The two plays of Day, containing pastoral elements, are reprinted by A. H. Bullen in his ed. of that dramatist, 1881. Further references to each of these authors have been made above, sections viii and xiii. Aside from the mention of **John Fletcher's pastoral,** *The Faithful Shepherdess*, which belongs to every discussion of Fletcher and his plays and especially to the writers on the pastoral noted above, the Introduction to the ed. of *The Faithful Shepherdess*, by F. W. Moorman, *Temple Dramatists*, 1897, should likewise be consulted. *Sicelides*, the piscatory of Phineas Fletcher, is reprinted by A. B. Grosart in his ed. of that poet, *Fuller Worthies' Library*, 4 vols., 1869. **Ben Jonson's pastoral fragment,** *The Sad Shepherd*, is reprinted in all

complete eds. of Jonson. See, also, Greg, "On the Date of *The Sad Shepherd*," *Mod. Lang. Quarterly*, v, 1902; and especially his excellent ed. of Jonson's pastoral, *Materialien zur Kunde*, xi, 1905. A new ed. of *The Queen's Arcadia*, *The Faithful Shepherdess*, and *The Sad Shepherd*, with an introduction by J. B. Fletcher, is promised in the *Belles Lettres Series*.

The best account of **Randolph's pastoral drama**, *Amyntas*, is that of Greg in his *Pastoral Poetry*, as above. On the plays which follow the *Arcadia*, see K. Brunhuber, *Sidney's Arcadia und ihre Nachläufer*, 1903; there is likewise an unpublished thesis by H. W. Hill, Chicago, 1904, on the same topic.

## XVII. TRAGICOMEDY AND "ROMANCE"

The starting-point of the English conception of **tragicomedy** is the passage from the preface to the Reader prefixed by Fletcher to his *Faithful Shepherdess*. On the growth of tragicomedy, see Ward in general; A. H. Thorndike, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 1901; A. F. von Schack, *Die englischen Dramatiker vor, neben und nach Shakespeare*, 1893; B. Wendell, *William Shakspere, a Study in Elizabethan Literature*, 1894; and W. G. Courthope, *A History of English Poetry*, 1895–1903, especially vol. iv. E. E. Stoll, *John Webster*, 1905, adds much interesting research to this as to other kindred topics.

The problem of the **authorship of the Beaumont-Fletcher-Massinger plays** (suggested by Coleridge in 1818, and in the Introduction to Darley's ed. of *Beaumont and Fletcher*, 1839) was first formally broached by F. G. Fleay, "On Metrical Tests as Applied to Dramatic Poetry," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874. R. Boyle followed, in the same, 1880–86, and in *Engl. Stud.* v–x, 1881–87, pressing the claims of Massinger. E. H. Oliphant, in three excellent papers, reviewed the problem in the same, xiv-xvi, 1890–

92, emphasizing the work of Beaumont; and Boyle replied, not without acrimony, *ibid.* xvii–xviii. Meanwhile, the valuable monograph of C. G. Macaulay, noted above, had appeared, 1882; and Fleay restated the whole question with fertile surmise in his *Biographical Chronicle*, 1891. See, also, R. Boyle's inquiry into "Daborne's Share in Beaumont and Fletcher's Plays," *Engl. Stud.* xxvi, 1899; and A. E. H. Swaen, "Daborne's Plays," *Anglia*, xx and xxi, 1897 and 1898. This problem of divided authorship enters more or less into most later discussions of these poets, among which may be especially named the study of A. H. Thorndike, *The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 1901; and O. L. Hatcher's excellent *John Fletcher, a Study in Dramatic Method*, Chicago Thesis, 1905.

**On the relations of Fletcher and Shakespeare in the drama,** see once more especially the scholarly and exhaustive monograph of A. H. Thorndike, already several times mentioned. The relations of these two authors to *Henry VIII* have already received our attention (see section vii of this Essay above), and form part of every discussion of Fletcher. On *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, see the "Letter" of W. Spaulding on the authorship of this play, 1833, reprinted in the *New Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1876, together with the contributions of Littledale, Furnivall, Ingram, and Fleay in the same publication. Another earlier communication on "The Shares of Shakespeare and Fletcher in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*," by S. Hickson, 1847, is reprinted in the same, 1874. See, also, N. Delius, "Die angebliche Shakespeare-Fletcher'sche Autorschaft des Dramas *The Two Noble Kinsmen*," *Jahrbuch*, xiii, 1878, and R. Boyle on Massinger and the same play both in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1880–85. An excellent short résumé of the whole question is that of C. H. Herford in his ed. of the play, *Temple Dramatists*, 1897. See, also, the earlier reprint by H. Littledale for the *New Sh. Soc.* 1876; and P. Mackay, *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 1902. On the lost *Cardenio*, see

the note of Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, ed. 1898, vol. ii; and *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1895–96; and especially J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly's corrective, in his ed. of Shelton's *Don Quixote*, *Tudor Translations*, 1896, vol. i, of the inconsistencies of Fleay (*Chronicle*, 1891, *passim*).

Of the romances of Shakespeare, *Timon* and *Pericles* have already found mention in section xiii above. For a résumé of the questions involved in the source of *Cymbeline* and other like matters, see Ward, vol. ii. See, also, B. Leonhardt, "Ueber die Quellen *Cymbeline*," *Anglia*, vi, 1883; H. H. Vaughan, *New Readings and Renderings of Shakespeare's Tragedies*, 1886; R. W. Boodle, *Notes and Queries*, November 19, 1887; and the discussion of *Cymbeline*, by W. J. Craig, *Oxford Shakespeare*, 1894. The folio text is reprinted for the *New Sh. Soc.* 1883; for the "time analysis," see P. A. Daniel in the same, 1879. The excellent Introduction of E. Dowden to his American ed. of *Cymbeline*, 1907, should also be consulted. For the questions which have arisen concerning *The Winter's Tale*, see Furness, *Variorum ed.* of that play, 1898. The obvious source (recognized by Gildon and Rowe) is discussed by N. Delius, "Greene's *Pandosto* and Shakespeare's *Winter Tale*," *Jahrbuch*, xv, 1880; and further contributed to by E. Koeppel in "Zur Quellenkunde der Stuarts-Dramen," *Archiv*, xcvii, 1896. *The Winter's Tale* has attracted much attention, like other late plays of Shakespeare, on the score of its versification. On the topic, see in general, C. Bathurst, *Remarks on the Difference in Shakespeare's Versification*, 1857; and J. K. Ingram, "History of Verse Tests in General," *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1874. On both these plays, see F. Boas, *Der Sturm und Das Wintermärchen in ihrer symbolischen Bedeutung*, 1882; and R. Boyle, *Shakespeares Wintermärchen und Sturm*, 1885. Conjecture as to the date of *The Tempest* began with J. Holt in 1749, and, being a matter quite indeterminable, is likely to continue. The source of *The Tempest* has proved equally fertile and particularly attractive to German scholars because of a simi-

larity discerned between Shakespeare's play and the *Comedia von der schönen Sidea*, by Jacob Ayrer. On both topics, see Furness, *Variorum Tempest*, 1892. A few contributions to these topics are E. Malone, *An Account of the Incidents from which The Tempest was derived*, 1808; J. Hunter, *Disquisition on the Scene, Origin, and Date of The Tempest*, 1839; K. J. Clement, *Shakespeares Sturm, historisch beleuchtet*, 1846; J. Meissner, *Untersuchungen über Shakespeares Sturm*, 1872, an important paper; F. Brockehoff, *Ueber Shakespeares Sturm*, 1880; C. C. Hense, "Das Antike in Shakespeare's Drama, der Sturm," *Jahrbuch*, xv, 1880; J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Memoranda on Shakespeares Tempest*, 1880. Later articles are P. Roden, *Shakespeares Sturm, ein Kulturbild*, 1893; the notable one by R. Garnett in the *Universal Review*, 1889; the Introduction and Appendix to A. W. Verity's Pitt Press ed. of *The Tempest*, 1896; J. de Perott discovers Spanish sources for *The Tempest*, in *Publications of Clarke University Library*, i, 1906.

**The typical Fletcherian tragicomedy** is best studied in *Philaster*. The only separate modern ed. is that of F. S. Boas, *Temple Dramatists*, 1898. *Philaster* appears with *The Maid's Tragedy*, in the recent ed. of A. H. Thorndike, *Belles Lettres Series*, 1906; prefixed is an excellent Introduction and appended an equally valuable bibliography. An elaborate article is that of B. Leonhardt, "Ueber Beziehungen von *Philaster* zu *Hamlet* und *Cymbeline*," *Anglia*, viii, 1885; the same writer examines the chief textual variations in *Anglia*, xix, 1896. A recent article by J. de Perott, in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxii, 1907, treats of the relations of *Philaster* and other plays of Beaumont and Fletcher to *The Mirror of Knighthood*.

For Spanish literature in general, see the older authority, G. Ticknor, *History of Spanish Literature*, 3 vols., 1849. An excellent modern history is that of J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly, 1898. See, also, J. G. Underhill, *Spanish Literature in the England of the Tudors*, Columbia Thesis, 1899, to which is appended a list of such books and a bibliography.

**Spanish sources in Elizabethan drama** (especially in the plays of Fletcher and several of them long since noticed by Langbaine, Weber, Dyce, and others) have of late attracted the attention of several scholars. Some of these researches are A. L. Stiefel, "Die Nachahmung spanischer Komödien in England unter den ersten Stuarts," *Romanische Forschungen*, v, 1890; L. Bahlsen, "Spanische Quellen der dramatischen Litteratur besonders Englands zu Shakespeares Zeit," *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, n. f. vi, 1893; and "Eine Comödie Fletchers ihre spanische Quelle," *Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Jahresbericht der sechsten städtischen Realschule zu Berlin*, 1894, by the same; A. L. Stiefel, "Die Nachahmung spanischer Komödien in England," *Archiv*, xcix, 1897; "Ueber die Quelle von Fletchers *Island Princess*," by the same, in the same, ciii, 1899; A. S. W. Rosenbach, "The Curious Impertinent in English Drama," *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xvii, 1902: part of a larger unpublished study, *Spanish Sources of Plays of Beaumont and Fletcher*. The Spanish sources of these plays, like others, are well collected by Koeppel in his "Quellen Studien," *Münchener Beiträge*, xi, 1895. The Spanish and other sources of Fletcher afford a favorite theme, too, in the process of reaching the German doctorate: *The Knight of Malta* (E. Blühn, Halle); *The Spanish Curate* (E. Klein, Berlin); *The Honest Man's Fortune* (K. Richter, Halle), each "*und seine Quellen*" appearing in 1903–05. More important is the excellent Introduction of J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly to his translation of *Cervantes' Exemplary Novels*, 1902, in its discussions of the influence of that famous work on English drama. On the *Spanish Pastoral Romances*, see, also, H. A. Rennert, in *Mod. Lang. Publ.* vii, 1892, as above. Similarities to various Spanish prose romances have been discovered in *Twelfth Night*, by Klein, *Geschichte des Dramas*, 1865–79, vol. ix, and by L. Bahlsen in *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, vi, 1893.

For the **French and other romances as sources**, also

drawn upon for Fletcherian plays, see H. Körting, *Geschichte des französischen Romans*, 1891; for *Early English Metrical Romances*, see the collection of G. Ellis, 1868; see, also, J. Thoms, *Early English Prose Romances*, 3 vols., 1858. Heywood's *Royal King and Loyal Subject* has been edited, with an inquiry into its sources in Painter and its relations to Fletcher's *Loyal Subject*, by K. W. Tibbals, Pennsylvania Thesis, 1906; see, also, E. Koeppel, *Quellen Studien*, i, 1895, "Anhang," and O. Kempfer, Halle Diss. 1903, on this subject.

The standard ed. of **Philip Massinger** is that of W. Gifford, 4 vols., 1805, 2d ed. 1813. It is preceded by an excellent Memoir by J. Ferrier. Other eds. are those of T. Coxeter, 1761; of J. M. Mason, 4 vols., 1779; W. Harness, 1830–31; H. Coleridge (with Ford, one vol.), 1840; and F. Cunningham, which adds the play *Believe as You List*, 1870. Five of the better known plays of Massinger were included in the volume of the *Mermaid Series* edited by A. Symons, 1887. Aside from earlier mention by H. Hallam in his *Literature of Europe*, American ed. 1872, vol. iii, and W. Hazlitt in his *Lectures on the Age of Elizabeth*, 1821, ed. 1902, vol. v, S. R. Gardiner contributed an excellent paper on "The Political Element in Massinger" to the *Contemporary Review*, xxviii, 1876, reprinted for the *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* of the same year. Of equal value, though of more general content, is the essay on "Massinger" by L. Stephen, *Cornhill Magazine*, 1877, later republished in his *Hours in a Library*, 1879, third series. There is likewise a painstaking paper by J. Phelan in *Anglia*, ii, 1879. The brilliant essay of A. C. Swinburne, *Fortnightly Review*, lii, 1889, should also be consulted. For **Massinger's relations to Fletcher**, R. Boyle's three papers on "Beaumont, Fletcher, and Massinger," *Engl. Stud.* v–x, 1882–87, and the same author in *New Sh. Soc. Trans.* 1880–86, should be especially consulted. Boyle is likewise the author of the notice of Massinger in *D. N. B.* xxxvii, 1894; diverse results on many points will be found in Fleay's *Chronicle*,

1891. The sources of Massinger in general are well treated by E. Koeppel, "Quellen Studien zu den Dramen Massingers," *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxxii, 1897; see, also, the earlier paragraphs by the same on "Massinger and Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*," and on the relations of Heywood and Massinger in *A Challenge for Beauty* in the "Anhang" of his "Quellen Studien" in *Münchener Beiträge*, xi, 1895.

Among **single dramas of Massinger** which have attracted the attention of individual students may be mentioned: *Believe as You List*, first printed for the *Percy Society* in 1848 by C. Croker (see, also, the remarks on the text in *Old Sh. Soc. Papers*, iv, 1849); *The Maid of Honor* (K. Raebel), *The Great Duke of Florence* (H. A. Shunds), both 1901; *The Picture* (A. Merle), 1905; *The Renegado* (T. Heckmann), 1905, all of Halle; and *The Fatal Dowry* (C. Beck, Erlangen), 1906. The Pennsylvania Thesis on the *Unnatural Combat* and its relations to the story of the Cenci, by C. Stratton, 1904, has already been mentioned. Single eds. of other plays discussed in the chapter on Tragicomedy and "Romance" are *The Female Rebellion*, reprinted by A. Smith, Glasgow, 1872; and *Swetnam, the Woman Hater*, Grosart's *Occasional Issues*, 1875–81, vol. xiv.

## XVIII. LATER COMEDY OF MANNERS

For the **history of the Stuart stage**, the play lists of Sir Henry Herbert are especially valuable. They will be found abstracted and with comment both in the Malone *Variorum Shakspeare*, vol. iii, and in Collier, *History of English Dramatic Poetry and Annals of the Stage*, new ed. 1879. Fleay has also made free use of them in his *Chronicle* and in his *History of the London Stage*, which despite many faults and inconsistencies must still continue our main guide. On the Stuart, as on the earlier, actors, see J. P. Collier's *Memoirs of Actors*, *Old Sh. Soc. Publ.* 1846. *The*

*Memoirs of Alleyn* and *The Alleyn Papers*, in the same, 1841 and 1843, still afford valuable material. Our information concerning the hack writer **Robert Daborne** is derived chiefly from the last mentioned source. A. E. H. Swaen discusses "Daborne's Plays" in *Anglia*, xx and xxi, 1897 and 1898. For his alleged part in the Fletcherian plays, see R. Boyle, *Engl. Stud.* xxvi, 1899. The comedies of Fletcher for convenience have been treated together above in section xi of this Essay. As to **Massinger's comedies of manners**, *A New Way to Pay Old Debts* has been frequently reëdited: by K. Deighton, for example, in 1893; and by G. Stronach in *The Temple Dramatists*, 1904. A new ed. (with *The Roman Actor*) is promised, edited by F. P. Emery for *The Belles Lettres Series*. *The City Madam* has been neglected by editor and monographist alike.

Thomas May has already received notice above in section xiii of this Essay. **Robert Davenport** is sufficiently noticed by A. H. Bullen in the Introduction to his ed. of Davenport's Plays, *Old English Plays, New Series*, 1890, vol. iii. There is also an essay on *King John and Matilda* in *Retrospective Review*, iv, 1821. The Plays of **Richard Brome** have been reprinted by Pearson in 3 vols., 1873. A review of this ed. by J. A. Symonds, *Academy*, March, 1874, contains an excellent appraisement of that playwright. A. W. Ward contributes the notice of Brome to the *D. N. B.* vi, 1886; and there is likewise a meritorious dissertation on him by E. K. R. Faust, *Archiv*, lxxxii, 1887. See, also, A. C. Swinburne, in *Fortnightly Review*, lvii, 1892. The Dramatic Works of **Sir Aston Cockayne** and those of **Shakerley Marmion** were edited by J. Maidment and W. H. Logan in 1874 and in 1875; *The Comedies, Tragicomedies, with other Poems*, 1651, of **William Cartwright** remain unedited. Cartwright's borrowings from Jonson will be found duly recorded by Miss A. Henry in her ed. of *Epicœne, Yale Studies in English*, xxxi, 1906. The Plays and Poems of **Henry Glapthorne** were also reprinted by Pearson, 2 vols., 1874; and *The Lady Mother* by

A. H. Bullen in his *Old English Plays*, 1883, vol. ii. There is an essay on Glapthorne in *Retrospective Review*, x, 1824. Bullen also reprinted the Duke of Newcastle's *Country Captain*, under title *Captain Underwit*, in his *Old English Plays*; and **Thomas Nabbes** entire, in the new series of the same, 2 vols., 1887, with a justly appreciative prefatory essay. All of the playwrights named in this paragraph find place in the *D. N. B.*, where further authorities concerning them are likewise mentioned. The Duke of Newcastle, from his station and wider political interests, is theme for several biographies; of these the best is that of C. H. Firth, 1886.

The authoritative ed. of the **Works of James Shirley** is that of A. Dyce, 6 vols., 1833. A few of "the Best Plays" were edited for the *Mermaid Series* by E. Gosse, 1888. A valuable anonymous essay on Shirley is that contributed to *The Quarterly Review*, xlix, 1833; see, also, the admirable essay of A. C. Swinburne in *Fortnightly Review*, n. s. xlvii, 1890. The article on Shirley in the *D. N. B.* lii, 1897, was contributed by A. W. Ward. Charles Kingsley's strictures on *The Gamester* will be found in his *Plays and Puritans*, 1873; see, on the same topic, S. R. Gardiner in his *History of England*, new ed. 1904–05, vol. vii. P. Nissen writes on *James Shirley, ein Beitrag zur englischen Literaturgeschichte*, 1901; O. Gärtner, on *Shirley, sein Leben und Werken*, Halle Diss. 1904.

## XIX. DECADENT ROMANCE

On the **Spanish sources of plays of Shirley**, see A. L. Stiefel, "Die Nachahmung spanischer Komödien in England unter den ersten Stuarts," *Romanische Forschungen*, v, 1890; and A. Dessoff, "Ueber englische, italienische und spanische Dramen," *Studien für vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte*, i, 1901. On the romantic plays, as on the comedies, see the authorities on Shirley cited in the last section.

The work of **John Ford** was first collected by H. Weber, 2 vols., 1811; again by W. Gifford, 2 vols., 1827. The revi-

sion of this ed. by A. Dyce, 3 vols., 1869, remains the best. H. Coleridge edited Ford, with Massinger, in 1840–48; an ed., nearly complete, of the plays of Ford, is that of H. Ellis, *Mermaid Series*, 1888. Besides the earlier general critics, Coleridge, Schlegel, Lamb, Hazlitt, and the like, F. M. von Bodenstedt treats sympathetically of Ford in his *Shakespeares Zeitgenossen*, 1858–60. *The Fortnightly Review*, xvi, 1871, contains a fine criticism of Ford by A. C. Swinburne; and A. W. Ward contributes the notice of that poet to the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, ed. 1879. M. Wolff devotes a Diss. (Heidelberg) to *Ford, ein Nachahmer Shakespeare's*, 1880; and A. H. Bullen contributes the notice of Ford to *D. N. B.* xix, 1899. The sources of Ford have been thoroughly treated by Koeppel in *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxxii, 1897. See, also, the unpublished Harvard Thesis of S. P. Sherman, *Ford's Debt to his Predecessors and Contemporaries, and his Contribution to the Decadence of the Drama*, 1906, and *Metrische Untersuchungen zu John Ford*, by Hannemann, Halle, 1888. V. Gehler, *Das Verhältniss von Fords Perkin Warbeck zu Bacons Henry VII*, Halle Diss. 1895, has already been noted. A parallel between *'Tis Pity* and Parthenius of Nicæa is suggested by W. Bang in *Engl. Stud.* xxxvi, 1906. *The Broken Heart* has been separately edited by C. Scollard, 1895, and recently by O. Smeaton, for the *Temple Dramatists*, 1906. Apparently none of Ford's other plays has received a like attention, save *Perkin Warbeck*, which, as noted above, was edited by J. P. Pickburn and J. LeG. Brereton, 1896.

The bibliography of Richard Brome has been noted in section xviii above. The source of *Queen and Concubine* is discussed by E. Koeppel, in the *Appendix* to his "Quellen Studien," *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxxii, 1897. Arthur Wilson has received attention disproportionate to his merit: *The Inconstant Lady* was edited by P. Bliss, 1814; *The Swizzer*, by A. Feuillerat, 1904. Both contain full discussions of Wilson and his work. *The Works of* Sir

**William Davenant** were collected in a pretentious folio, 1673; the only modern ed. is that of J. Maidment and W. H. Logan, 5 vols., 1872. An essay on Davenant by K. Elze will be found in *Jahrbuch*, iv, 1869; the notice in *D. N. B.* xiv, 1888, is by the late J. Knight. A paper on "The Source of *Albovine*" is contributed by A. Campbell to the *Journal of Germanic Philology*, iv, 1902. An account of **Sir William Lower**, by W. T. Seccombe, will be found in *D. N. B.* xxxiv, 1893. Lower's plays have not been reprinted; nor have the other specimens of recrudescent romance. *The Poems and Plays* of **Sir John Suckling** were first collected in his *Fragmenta Aurea*, 1646, and have been often reprinted; a later ed. is that of W. C. Hazlitt, 2 vols., 1874, new ed. 1892. The notice of Suckling in *D. N. B.* lv, 1898, is by T. Seccombe. There is also a Diss. by H. Schwartz on *Suckling*, 1881.

The more general works on Spanish influences named in the last section of this Essay need not be repeated here. Older French works particularly valuable here are S. M. Giradin, *Cours de Littérature Dramatique*, 1855; V. Cousin, *La Société Française au xviii^e Siècle*, 1873. H. Körting, *Geschichte des französischen Romans*, 1891, is helpful in tracing incidents.

The point of departure for the Heroic Play is Dryden's *Of Heroic Plays*, Scott-Saintsbury ed. of Dryden, 1882–93, vol. iv. The concern of this book is merely with **the forerunners of the heroic play**, on which, besides such treatment as the subject receives in the larger histories of literature and the drama (of which enough has been said), the following, presenting different phases of the matter, may be consulted: W. A. Neilson, "The Origins and Sources of the Court of Love," *Harvard Studies*, vi, 1899; J. B. Fletcher, "Précieuses at the Court of Charles I," an admirable study, *Journal of Comparative Literature*, i, 1903; L. N. Chase, *The English Heroic Play*, a somewhat unsatisfactory work; J. S. Harrison, *Platonism in English Poetry of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*, both

Columbia Theses, 1903; the excellent paper, "The Rise of the Heroic Play," by C. G. Child, *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xix, 1904; and J. W. Tupper, "The Relation of the Heroic Play to the Romances of Beaumont and Fletcher," in the same, xx, 1905.

**Lodowick Carlell,** long neglected, has been recently considered in an excellent Thesis (Chicago), 1905, by C. H. Gray, prefixed to a reprint of *The Deserving Favorite;* Carlell's other plays remain unedited. Most of them are described by Genest, vol. x. *The Comedies and Tragedies of* **Thomas Killigrew** were collected in a sumptuous folio, 1664. Since then, *The Parson's Wedding* alone appears to have been reprinted, in Dodsley, xiv, and little appraisement has been made of Killigrew's contributions to the "romance." The notices of Carlell and Killigrew in *D. N. B.* are by J. Knight. Ralph Freeman's *Imperiale*, edited by C. C. Gumm, with an Introduction setting forth its relations to later Senecan drama, is among the unpublished Theses of the University of Pennsylvania, 1907. Nabbes' *Unfortunate Mother* appears with his other plays in A. H. Bullen's ed. *Old English Plays*, n. s. 2 vols., 1887. *The Marriage Night*, *The Rebellion*, *Andromana*, *The Queen of Aragon*, and *The Lost Lady*, all are contained in the last four vols. of Dodsley's *Old Plays;* Quarles' *Virgin Widow*, in Grosart's ed. of *Francis Quarles*, *Chertsey Worthies' Library*, 1880, vol. iii; *The Queen or The Excellency of her Sex* has recently been edited by W. Bang in *Materialien zur Kunde*, xiii, 1903, and ascribed to Ford.

As the last chapter of this book on *The Drama in Retrospect* has to do with summaries, no further bibliography is necessary. The few authorities therein cited have already found their place in the previous pages.

# A LIST OF PLAYS AND LIKE PRODUCTIONS WRITTEN, ACTED, OR PUBLISHED IN ENGLAND BETWEEN THE YEARS 1558 AND 1642

Titles of extant plays are printed in Roman; non-extant plays in *Italics*. The first date following a title is that of probable composition or acting, and is usually only approximate; the second date is that of earliest publication. Where but one date follows a title, the year of acting and publication coincide. Where no name of author is given, authorship is unascertained. Plays reprinted only in collections or in separate modern editions are so noted; for modern editions of other plays, see the editions of their respective authors in the Bibliographical Essay.

S. R. stands for the Register of the Stationers' Company; Revels, for *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court*; H. for *Henslowe's Diary*, the recent edition by W. W. Greg, 1904. Short titles, such as Collier, Fleay, or Hazlitt, will be found explained at the beginning of the Bibliographical Essay. Other abbreviations, such as Com. for comedy, Lic. for licensed, Tr. for translation, or T. C. for tragicomedy, should be clear without further comment.

*Abraham and Lot*, Bible Play. 1594. H. 16.

Abraham's Sacrifice, The Tragedy of, Tr. Beza. Golding, A. 1575, 1577. Ed. M. W. Wallace, 1907.

*Absalon*. Watson, J. Described by Ascham, 1563. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 229.

*Absolom*. 1602. H. 182.

*Abuses*, Sat'l. Com. 1606. One with Sir Thomas More. Fleay, ii, 312.

*Actæon and Diana*, Com. 1640, n. d. Hazlitt, 2; Greg, ii, xlvii.

Adelphe, Lat. Tr. Terence. 1613. MS. Trinity Coll. Cambridge, 1662. *Retros. Rev.* xii.

Adelphi, Tr. Bernard, R. Terence in English, 1598. *Retros. Rev.* xii.

Adrasta, or the Woman's Spleen and Love's Conquest, T. C. Jones, J. 1635.

Adrasta Parentans sive Vindicta, Lat. Tr. Mease, P. 1618–27. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10417. Hazlitt, 3.

*Adson's Masque*. N. d. (17th century.) Mentioned in a

*Book of Tunes, Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10444. See Halliwell, 4.

*Æmilia*, Lat. Com. Cecil, E. Cambridge, 1615. *Miscellaneous State Papers*, i, 394.

*Æneas and Queen Dido, The History of.* Acted at Chester, 1563. Chambers, ii, 356.

*Æsop's Crow*, Court Play. 1561. Mentioned in G. Baldwin's *Beware the Cat*, 1561. See Collier, i, 152.

Agamemnon, Tr. Studley, J. 1566. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

*Agamemnon*, Trag. Dekker, Chettle. 1599. H. 109.

*Agamemnon and Ulysses.* 1584. Revels, 188.

Aglaura, Trag. and T. C. Suckling, J. 1637, 1638. Collected ed. W. C. Hazlitt, 1892.

Agrippina. See Julia Agrippina.

*Ajax and Ulysses.* 1572. Revels, 13.

*Ajax Flagellifer*, Lat. Tr. Sophocles. Cambridge, 1564. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 179.

Alaham, Senecan Trag. Greville, F. *C.* 1600. Folio, 1633. Works, ed. Grosart, 1870.

Alarum for London. See A Larum for London.

Alba, sive Annus Recurrens (also called Vertumnus), Past. Oxford, 1605. Nichols, *James*, i, 547.

"*Albe*[*t*]*re Galles.*" Heywood, Smith. 1602. H. 180. Fleay, i, 290, queries Nobody and Somebody.

Albertus Wallenstein. See Wallenstein.

Albion Knight, Moral. Lic. 1566. Fragment printed, *Sh. Soc. Pub.* i, 1844.

Albion's Triumph, Masque. Townsend, A. 1632. See Brotanek, 362.

Albovine, King of Lombards, Trag. Davenant, W. 1626, 1629.

Albumazar, Com. Tomkins, J. 1614, 1615. Dodsley, xi. See Greg, ii, p. xlvii.

Alchemist, The, Com. Jonson, B. 1610, 1612. *Belles Lettres Series*, 1903.

*Alcmæon.* 1573. Revels, 51.

*Alexander and Lodowick*, "Romance." Slater, M. 1597. H. 50. Cf. A. H. Smyth, *Sh.'s Pericles*, p. 57.

Alexander, Campaspe, and Diogenes. See Campaspe.

Alexander VI, The Tragedy of Pope. See The Devil's Charter.

Alexandræan Tragedy, The. Alexander, W. 1604, 1605. Works, ed. 1872.

*Alexias or the Chaste Gallant*, Trag. Massinger, P. Lic. 1639. Warburton.

Alexius Imperator sive Andronicus Comnenus, Lat. Trag. Before 1642? *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane*, 1767. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 256.

Alfredus. See Aluredus.

*Alice Pierce*, Hist.? 1597. H. 70.

All Fools, Com. Chapman, G. 1599, 1605.

All for Money, Moral Sat. Lupton, T. 1577, 1578. Ed. Vogel, *Jahrbuch*, xl, 1904.

*All is not Gold that Glisters*, Com.? Chettle, Rowley, S. 1601. H. 135.

All is True. See Henry VIII.

All's Lost by Lust, Trag. Rowley, W. 1619, 1633. Ed. C. W. Stork, 1907.

All's One, or One of the Four Plays in One called A Yorkshire Tragedy. See A Yorkshire Tragedy.

All's Well that Ends Well, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1598–1602. Folio, 1623.

*Almanac, The*. 1612. Revels, 211.

Alphonsus, Emperor of Germany. "Peele, G." (Kirkman, 1661); "Chapman, G.?" (Langbaine, 1691). 1590? 1654. Ed. Elze, 1867.

Alphonsus, King of Aragon. Greene, R. 1589, 1599.

Althorpe, Entertainment of the Queen and Prince at. Jonson, B. 1603, 1604.

*Alucius, The History of*. 1579. Revels, 154.

Aluredus sive Alfredus Tragicocommœdia. Drury, W. 1620. *Dramatica Poemata*, 1628.

*Amazons, Masque of*. 1579. Revels, 125.

Amazonians' Masque, The. 1618. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10444. Nichols, *James*, iii, 453.

Ambitious Politic, The. See The Lovesick Court.

Amends for Ladies, Com. Field, N. 1611, 1618. *Nero and Other Plays*, Mermaid ed. 1888.

[Aminta], Tr. Tasso. Fraunce, A. *The Countess of Pembroke's Ivychurch*, 1591.

Aminta, Tr. Tasso. Reynolds, H. 1628. See Greg, *Pastoral*, 238.

*Amoribus Perinthi et Tyanthes*, Com. Burton, W. 1596. *Athen. Oxon.* viii, 155.

Amorous War, The, Com. Mayne, J. 1639, 1648.

Amphrissa, or the Forsaken Shepherdess, Past. Dialog. Heywood, T. Perhaps 1597. *Pleasant Dialogues*, 1637.

Amyntas, or the Impossible Dowry, Past. Randolph, T. Before 1635. *Poems . . . and Amyntas*, 1638.

Amyntas, The Lamentations of, for the Death of Phillis, Tr. Tasso. Fraunce, A. 1587. *The Countess of Pembroke's Ivychurch*, 1591.

Andria, Tr. Terence. Terens in Englysh, n. d.

Andria, Tr. Bernard, R. Terence in English, 1598.

Andria, Tr. Terence. Newman, T. The Two First Comedies of Terence, 1627.

Andria, the first Comedy of Terence in English, Tr. Kyffin, M. 1588.

Andromana, the Merchant's Wife, Trag. S., J. 1660. Dodsley, xiv.

Andronicus Comnenus. See Alexius Imperator.

*Angel King, The*. Lic. Oct. 1624. Herbert's List. Collier, i, 448.

*Antic Play and a Comedy, An*. 1585. Revels, 189.

Antigone, Lat. Tr. Sophocles. Watson, T. 1581.

Antigone, The Tragedy of, the Theban Princess. May, T. 1630, 1631.

Antipo, Trag. Verney, F. 1622. MS. 4°, Lee Warly Collection, near Canterbury. Hazlitt, 14.

Antipodes, The, Com. Brome, R. 1638, 1640.

Antiquary, The, Com. Marmion, S. 1636, 1641. Dodsley, xiii.

1, Antonio and Mellida, T. C. Marston, J. 1599, 1602.

2, Antonio and Mellida. See Antonio's Revenge.

*Antonio and Vallia.* See *Vallia and Antony.*

*Antonio and Vallia*, Com. Massinger, P. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

"Antonio of Ragusa," Hist.? *Bodleian MS. Rawl. Poet.* 93. Hazlitt, 15.

Antonio's Revenge, Trag. Marston, J. 1599, 1602.

Antonius, Tr. Trag. Garnier. Sidney, M., Countess of Pembroke. 1590, 1592. Ed. A. Luce, *Litterar-historische Forschungen*, iii, 1897.

Antonius Bassianus Caracalla. See Caracalla.

*Antony and Cleopatra*, Trag. Greville, F., Lord Brooke. Destroyed, 1601. The author's *Life of Sidney*, Grosart, *Greville*, iv, 155.

Antony and Cleopatra, Trag. Shakespeare, W. 1607–08. Folio, 1623.

*Antony and Vallia.* 1595. H. 24.

Anything for a Quiet Life, Com. Middleton, T. 1619–23, 1662.

Aphrodisial or Sea Feast, qy. Piscatory? Percy, W. 1602. *Percy MS.* No. 1. Duke of Devonshire's Library.

Apollo and Daphne, Dialogue, Tr. Ovid. Heywood, T. *Pleasant Dialogues*, 1637.

*Apollo and the Nine Muses*, Masque. 1572. Revels, 19.

Apollo Shroving, Sat'l. Com. Hawkins, W. Hadleigh, Suffolk, 1626, n. d.

Appius and Virginia, Hist. Moral. B[ower], R. *C.* 1563, 1575. Dodsley, iv.

Appius and Virginia, Trag. Webster, J. Before 1624, 1654.

*Apprentice's Prize, The*, Com.? Heywood, Brome. Before 1642. S. R. 1654.

Arabia Sitiens, or a Dream of a Dry Year, Sat'l. Com.? Percy, W. 1601. *Percy MS.* No. 2. Duke of Devonshire's Library.

*Ara Fortunæ*, device of *The Christmas Prince*, 1607.

Arcades, "Masque." Milton, J. 1633. *Poems both English and Latin*, 1645.

Arcadia, A Pastoral called the. Shirley, J. 1632, 1640.

Arcadia Reformed. See The Queen's Arcadia. Cf. Greg, *Pastoral*, 252 n.

Arcadian Lovers, The, or the Metamorphosis of Princes, Past. Moore, T.? Before 1642? *Bodléian MS. Rawl. Poet.* 3. Hazlitt, 17.

*Arcadian Virgin, The.* Chettle, Haughton. 1599. H. 116.

Arden of Feversham, Dom. Trag. 1586–92, 1592. Ed. Bayne, Temple Dramatists, 1897.

Argalus and Parthenia, T. C. Glapthorne, H. 1638, 1639. Bullen, Old English Plays, 1882, ii.

*Ariodante and Genevora.* 1582. Revels, 177.

Ariosto, Com. Gascoigne, G. Oxford, 1566. Probably Supposes. See M. L. Lee, *Narcissus*, xv.

Aristippus, or the Jovial Philosopher, Monologue. Randolph, T. 1629, 1630. Works, ed. Hazlitt, 1875.

Arraignment, The. See Poetaster.

Arraignment of London, The, Sat'l. Com.? Daborne, Tourneur. 1613. *Alleyn Papers*, 58.

Arraignment of Love, The. "A probable third title" for Glapthorne's Lady Mother or the Noble Trial. Fleay, i, 244.

Arraignment of Paris, The, Court. Peele, G. 1581, 1584.

Arthur. See The Misfortunes of Arthur.

*Arthur, King of England.* Hathway, R. 1598. H. 86.

*Arthur's Show.* Cf. 2 Henry IV, III, ii, 97. Hathway's *Life of King Arthur*, 1598.

1, 2, Arviragus and Philicia, T. C. Carlell, L. 1636, 1639.

Ashby, Masque of the Countess of Darby at. Marston, J. 1607. Grosart, *Occasional Issues*, xi, 1879.

*As Plain as Can Be*, Com.? 1567–68. Mentioned, *Brit. Mus. MS. Harl.* 146. Collier, i, 194.

*Aston's Masque, Hugh.* 1581? *MS. Ch. Ch. Oxford;* only music extant. See Davey, *History of Music*, 135.

Astræa, Dialogue between Two Shepherds in Praise of, the Countess of Pembroke. 1601. See Nichols, *Eliz.* iii, 529.

Astræa, or True Love's Mirror, Past. Willan, L. Before 1642? 1651.

As You Like It, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1599–1600. Folio, 1623.

Atalanta, Lat. Past. Parsons, P. 1611–1615. *Brit. Mus. MS. Harl.* 6924. See Greg, *Pastoral*, 235 n.

Atheist's Tragedy, The. Tourneur, C. 1603, 1611.

Augurs, The Masque of, Antimasque. Jonson, B. 1622, n. d.

Bad May Amend, The. See *Hannibal and Hermes.*

*Baiting of the Jealous Knight, The.* See *The Fair Foul One.*

Ball, The, Com. Chapman, Shirley. 1632, 1639.

Band, Cuff, and Ruff, Sat'l. Dialog. 1615. Halliwell-Phillipps, *Contributions to Early English Literature*, 1849.

Barkham, An Invention for Lord Mayor, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. See Fleay, ii, 371.

Barnavelt, The Tragedy of Sir John van Olden. Fletcher, Massinger. 1620, 1883 in Bullen's *Old English Plays*, ii.

Bartholomew Fair, Com. Jonson, B. 1614. Folio II, 1630–42.

Bashful Lover, The, T. C. Massinger, P. Lic. 1635. *Three New Plays*, 1655.

*Bateman's Masque.* (17th century.) *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10444. See *Adson's Masque.*

*Battle of Affliction*, Trag. Perhaps Battle of Affections. Cf. Pathomachia. Reg. 1656. Greg, ii, p. lii.

Battle of Agincourt, The. See Henry V, The Famous Victories of.

Battle of Alcazar, The. Peele, G. 1591, 1594.

*Battle of Hexham, The*, Hist.? Barnes, B. 1606? MS. sold in 1807 among Isaac Reed's books; since untraced.

Battle of the Vices against the Virtues, Moral. Temp. Charles I. Thorpe, Cat. 1835. Fleay, ii, 337.

Baxter's [Barkstead's] Tragedy. See The Insatiate Countess.

*Bays*. Mentioned 1656. Greg, ii, p. lii.

*Bear a Brain*. See *Better Late than Never*.

Bearing Down the Inn. See The Cuckqueans' Errants.

Beauties, The. See The Bird in a Cage.

Beauty, The Masque of. Jonson, B. 1608. *The Characters of Two Royal Masques*, n. d.

*Beauty and Housewifry, Comedy of*. 1582. Revels, 176.

*Beauty in a Trance*, Com. Ford, J. Before 1640. S. R. Sept. 1653. Warburton.

Beech's Tragedy. Haughton, Day. 1600. H. 117. Perhaps Two Lamentable Tragedies.

Beggar's Bush, Rom. Com. Beaumont and Fletcher [and Massinger]. 1622. Folio, 1647.

Believe as You List, Hist. Trag. Massinger, P. 1630. *Percy Society*, 1849, ed. C. Croker.

*Bellendon*, or *Belenden* [*Belin Dun*]. 1594. H. 17.

*Bellman of London, The*, "a play." Daborne, R. 1613. See *Alleyn Papers*, 66.

*Bellman of Paris, The, a French Tragedy*. Dekker, Day. Lic. July, 1623.

Bellum Grammaticale sive Nominum Verborumque Discordia Civilis, College Play, Tr. Guarna. 1581 or before, 1635. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 271.

Bendict and Betteris, probably Much Ado About Nothing, but see H. H. Furness, *Variorum* of the latter, p. xxi.

*Bendo, or Byndo, and Richardo*, Com. 1591. H. 13. See A. Dessoff, *Studien für vergleich. Litt.* i.

Benefice, The, Sat'l. Com. Wilde, G. Cambridge, 1635–38, 1689. *Retros. Rev.* xii, 30.

Benjamin's Plot, Tragedy of. 1598. H. 98.

*Bernardo and Fiametta*, Rom. 1595. H. 25.

*Berowne*, or *Burbon*. 1602. H. 182.

Best Words wear the Garland. See Two Merry Milkmaids.

Bestrafte Brudermord, Der, oder Prinz Hamlet aus Dännemark. Kyd, Shakespeare, or anon.? Acted in Germany, *c*. 1603, pr. Reichard, 1778. Tr. Cohn, *Sh. in Germany*, 236.

*Better Late than Never.* Dekker, T. 1599. H. 110.
*Bilboe's the Best Blade.* See *Hard Shift for Husbands.*
Bird in a Cage, The, Rom. Com. Shirley, J. 1633.
Birth of Hercules, The, Tr. Plautus Amphitruo. 1610. Ed. M. W. Wallace, 1903.
Birth of Merlin, The, or the Child hath found his Father. Rowley W. 1597–1607, 1662.
Bisham, Pastoral Entertainment to the Queen at. 1592. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 130.
1, *Black Batman of the North*, Bourgeois Drama? Chettle, Wilson, Drayton, Dekker. 1598. H. 86.
2, *Black Batman of the North*, Murder Play? Chettle, Wilson. 1598. H. 89. Perhaps the same subject as The Vow Breaker.
1, *Black Dog of Newgate*, Bourgeois Drama? Hathway, Day, Smith. 1602. H. 185.
2, *Black Dog of Newgate.* Hathway, Day, Smith. 1603. H. 188.
*Black Joan.* Henslowe's Inventory. 1598. Collier's *Henslowe*, 276.
*Black Lady, The.* Lic. 1623. Fleay, ii, 325.
*Black Wedding, The*, Trag.? S. R. 1654.
Blackfriar's Masque. See Entertainment at the Earl of Newcastle's. Jonson.
Blackness, The Masque of. Jonson, B. 1605. *The Characters of Two Royal Masques*, n. d.
*Blacksmith's Daughter, The*, Com. of Travel. 1579. See Gosson, *School of Abuse, Sh. Soc.* p. 30.
Blind Beggar of Alexandria, The. Chapman, G. 1596, 1598.
1, Blind Beggar of Bednal Green, The, Com. Day, Chettle. 1600, 1659. Ed. W. Bang, *Materialien zur Kunde*, i, 1902.
2, *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green*, Com. Haughton, Day. 1601. H. 134.
3, *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green*, Com. Haughton, Day. 1601. H. 137.
*Blind eats many a Fly, The*, Com. Heywood, T. 1602. H. 185.

Bloody Banquet, The, Trag. "T. D." 1620. Greg, i. 136.
Bloody Brother, The, or Rollo, Duke of Normandy, Pseudo-Hist. Trag. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1616–24, 1639.
Blurt, Master Constable, or the Spaniard's Night-walk. Middleton, T. 1601, 1602.
*Boast [i. e. Boss] of Billingsgate*, Dom. Com.? Day, Hathway. 1603. H. 173.
*Bold Beachams, The*, Hist.? Heywood, T. 1600. Alluded to in The Knight of the Burning Pestle, Prologue and elsewhere.
Bondman, The, T. C. Massinger, P. 1623, 1624.
Bonduca, The Tragedy of. (Beaumont and) Fletcher [and Field?]. 1616. Folio, 1647.
*Bondwoman, The*. S. R. 1653.
*Bonos Nochios*, Intl. S. R. 1609.
*Boys, Masque of*. 1577. Fleay, ii, 341.
*Brandymer*. 1591. H. 13. Perhaps *Brandimart* and one with Greene's Orlando Furioso. Hazlitt, 30.
*Branhowlte (Brunhild)*, Hist. Trag.? 1597. H. 82. Cf. Thierry and Theodoret.
Brazen Age, The. Heywood, T. 1595, 1613.
Brennoralt, or the Discontented Colonel, T. C. Suckling, Sir J. 1639, n. d.
Bretbie, A Masque presented at. Cockayne, A. 1639. *A Chain of Golden Poems*, 1658.
Bride, The, Com. Nabbes, T. 1638, 1640. Bullen, *Old Plays*, 1887.
*Bristol, The Queen's Entertainment at*. 1574. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 407.
*Bristol Merchant, The*. Ford, Dekker. Lic. 1624.
*Bristol Tragedy, The*, Murder Play. Day, J., Rowley, S. 1602. H. 165.
Britannia Triumphans, Masque. Davenant, W. 1638.
Britannia's Honor. Dekker, T. 1628.
Broken Heart, The, Trag. Ford, J. 1629, 1633.
Brothers, The, Com. Shirley, J. Lic. 1626. *Six New Plays*, 1653.

*Brougham Castle, Entertainment at.* 1618. Airs alone extant. S. Smith, *Musica Antiqua*, 150. Nichols, *James*, iii, 392.

*Brox[burn]bury Masque, The.* (17th century.) *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10444. See *Adson's Masque.*

*Brute, The Conquest of,* Chron. Day, Chettle. 1598. H. 93.

*Brute Greenshield,* Chron. 1599. H. 103.

*Buck is a Thief, The,* Com. Lic. 1623. Queried by Fleay, ii, 328, as Wit at Several Weapons.

*Buckingham,* Chron. 1593. H. 16.

Bugbears, The, Com., Tr. Grazzini. 1561. Printed, *Archiv*, xcviii–c.

*Bull Masque, The.* (17th century.) *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10444. See *Adson's Masque.*

*Burbon,* Hist.? 1597. H. 54.

*Burone,* or *Burbon?* Hist.? 1602. H. 181. Qy. Chapman's Charles, Duke of Byron?

1, Bussy D'Ambois, Hist. Trag. Chapman, G. 1595–1600, 1607.

2, Bussy D'Ambois. See The Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois.

Byron, Masque of. *Brit. Mus. MS. Egerton*, 1994. Cf. Fleay, i, 64.

1, 2, Byron, Charles, Duke of, Hist. Trag. Chapman, G. Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron. 1608.

Byrsa Basilica seu Regale Excambium, Lat. Com. Rickets, J. 1570. *Bodleian MS. Tanner*, 207. Described, *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv.

2, *Cæsar.* 1595. H. 24. No first part mentioned.

*Cæsar and Pompey.* 1594. H. 20.

Cæsar and Pompey. Chapman, G. 1631. See The Wars of Pompey and Cæsar.

*Cæsar and Pompey, The History of.* Mentioned in *A Second Blast*, 1580. Cf. Revels, 167.

Cæsar and Pompey, The Tragedy of, or Cæsar's Revenge. 1594, 1607. See Craik's *English of Shakespeare*, 49.

*Cæsar's Fall.* "Munday, Drayton, Webster, and the rest." 1602. H. 166.

Cæsar's Revenge. See Cæsar and Pompey, The Tragedy of.

Calisto and Melibœa. See The Spanish Bawd.

*Calistus.* Mentioned in Second and Third Retreat, 1580. Qy. Calisto and Melibœa.

Cambises, A Lamentable Tragedy of. Preston, T. Reg. 1569–70, n. d. [1570]. Dodsley, iv.

Campaspe, Court Com. Lyly, J. 1580, 1584.

Campbell, or the Ironmongers' Fair Field, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1618, n. d.

Cancer, Lat. Com. Cambridge, pr. 1648.

Canterbury his Change of Diet, A New Play called, Sat'l. Dialog. Pr. 1641.

*Canute*, or *Hardicanute.* See *Hardiknute.*

Captain, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1613. Folio, 1647.

*Captain Mario*, Com. Gosson, S. 1579. See Fleay, i, 248.

Captain Thomas Stukeley. See Stukeley.

Captain Underwit. See The Country Captain.

Captives, The, or the Lost Recovered, T. C. Heywood, T. 1624. Bullen's *Old Plays*, iv, 1883.

*Capture of Stuhlweissenburg, A Comedy on the.* 1602. See "The Diary of the Duke of Stettin." *Trans. Royal Hist. Soc.* vi, 1892.

Caracalla, Antonius Bassianus, Senecan Lat. Trag. (17th century.) *Bodleian MS. Rawl. C.* 590. Described in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv.

Caradoc the Great. See The Valiant Welshman.

*Cardenio, The History of*, T. C.? Mentioned as acted June, 1613, Harrington's Accounts; S. R. as "by Shakespeare and Fletcher," Sept. 1653. See Introduction, Shelton's *Don Quixote*, Tudor Tr. i, p. xlvii.

Cardinal, The, Trag. Shirley, J. Lic. Nov. 1641. *Six New Plays*, 1653.

Cardinal Wolsey. See Wolsey.

*Cards, The Play of.* Mentioned in Harington's *Apology for Poetry*, 1591.

Careless Shepherdess, The, T. C. Goffe, T. 1623–29, 1656.

*Cariclea.* See *Theagenes and Chariclea.*

*Cartwright*, Murder Play. Haughton, W. 1602. H. 170.

Case is Altered, The, Com. Jonson, B. 1598, 1609.

*Castara or Cruelty without Lust.* S. R. 1654.

Catilina Triumphans, Com. (17th century.) MS. in Trinity College Library, Cambridge. Fleay, ii, 365.

*Catiline*, Trag. Wilson, R., the Elder. Mentioned by Lodge, *Defense of Stage Plays*, 1579, ed. Hunterian Club, p. 43. H. 94.

Catiline his Conspiracy, Trag. Jonson, B. 1611.

*Catiline's Conspiracies*, Trag. Gosson, S. Mentioned by Gosson, *School of Abuse*, 1579.

*Catiline's Conspiracy.* Wilson, Chettle. 1598. H. 132, 133.

Cawsome-House, Entertainment at. Campion, T. 1613.

Celestina. S. R. 1598. See The Spanish Bawd.

*Cenocephals* [*Cenofalls*]. See *Cynocephali.*

Censure of the Judges. See Mercurius Britannicus.

Certain Devices presented at Greenwich. See The Misfortunes of Arthur.

Chabot, Admiral of France, The Tragedy of. Chapman, Shirley. Revised 1635, 1639.

Challenge at Tilt, A., Barriers. Jonson, B. 1613. Folio, 1616.

Challenge for Beauty, A, T. C. Heywood, T. 1635, 1636.

Chance Medley, Com. Wilson, Munday, Dekker. 1598. H. 93.

Chances, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1609–15. Folio, 1647.

Changeling, The, Trag. Middleton, Rowley, W. 1632, 1653.

Changes, or Love in a Maze, Com. Shirley, J. 1632.

Character of a Mountebank. See News out of the West.

Charlemagne, T. C. 1589? Printed as The Distracted Emperor, by Bullen, *Old English Plays*, 1884, iii.

[Charles], Prince, Presentation for, on his Birthday, 1638, Entertainment. Nabbes, T. 1638. Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s. ii.

*Chaste Lady, The.* See *A Toy to please Chaste Ladies.*

*Chaste Lover, The.* See *Alexias.*

Chaste Maid in Cheapside, A, Com. Middleton, T. 1612–13, 1630.

*Chester, Tragedy of.* See *Randall, Earl of Chester.*

Chester's Triumph, Entertainment. Amerie, R. 1610. See Nichols, *James*, ii, 291.

Chief Promises of God, The, Intl. Bale, J. 1538, 1577.

Child hath lost (found) his Father. See The Birth of Merlin.

*Chinon of England*, Heroical Play. 1596. H. 27. Listed, 1656. Greg, ii, p. lvi.

Chloridia, Rites of Chloris and her Nymphs. Jonson, B. 1631, n. d.

Christ Jesus Triumphant, Antichrist Play, Tr. Foxe. Day, R. 1579. Herford, 138. See Greg, ii, p. cxxiii.

Christian Turned Turk, A, or the Tragical Lives of Two Famous Pirates, Ward and Dansiker. Daborne, R. 1610, 1612.

*Christianetta*, Com.? Brome, R. S. R. 1640.

*Christmas comes but once a year*, Com. Heywood, Dekker, Webster, Chettle. 1602. H. 184.

Christmas his Masque, Antimasque. Jonson, B. 1616. Folio II, 1632–40.

Christmas Prince, The. Series of dramatic performances at Oxford, 1607. See *Miscellanea Antiqua Anglorum*, i, 1816.

*Christ's Passion.* 1624. Mentioned in Histriomastix, 1633, p. 117 n.

Christ's Passion, a Tragedy, Tr. de Groot. Sandys, G. 1640. Works of Sandys, ed. Hooper, 1872, ii.

Christus Triumphans, Comœdia Apocalyptica. Foxe, J. 1550, 1551. See Herford, 138.

Chruso-thriambos, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1611.
Chrysanaleia, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1616.
*Cicero, Marcus Tullius, that Famous Roman Orator, his Tragedy.* Listed, 1651. Greg, ii, p. lvi.
1, 2, Cid, The, T. C., Tr. Corneille. Rutter, J. 1637 and 1640.
City Gallant, The. See Greene's Tu Quoque.
City Madam, The, Com. Massinger, P. 1619, 1658.
City Match, The, Com. Mayne, J. 1639. Dodsley, xiii.
City Nightcap, The, Com. Davenport, R. 1624, 1661. Dodsley, xiii.
City Pageant to the King of Denmark. Marston, J. 1606.
*City Shuffler, The*, Com. 1633. Warburton. See Collier, ii, 54.
City Wit, The, or the Woman wears the Breeches. Brome, R. 1629. *Five New Plays*, 1653.
1, *Civil Wars of France.* Dekker, T. 1598. H. 96.
2, 3, *Civil Wars of France.* Drayton, Dekker. 1598. H. 98, 99.
4, *Civil Wars of France, First Introduction of the.* Dekker, T. 1599. H. 100.
Civitatis Amor, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1616. Nichols, *James*, iii, 208.
Claracilla, T. C. Killigrew, T. 1636. The Prisoners and Claracilla, 1641.
Claudius Tiberius Nero, Rome's Greatest Tyrant, The Tragedy of. 1607.
*Cleander, The Tragedy of.* Lic. 1634. Malone's *Shakspeare*, iii, 230.
Cleodora. See The Queen of Aragon.
Cleopatra, The Tragedy of. Daniel, S. 1593. Delia and Rosamund Augmented, 1594.
Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt, The Tragedy of. May, T. 1626, 1639.
Clitophon. (17th century.) MS. Emmanuel College, Cambridge. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 317.
*Cloridon and Radiamanta.* 1572. Revels, 13.
*Clorys and Orgasto.* 1592. H. 13.

*Cloth Breeches and Velvet Hose*, Sat'l. Com.? S. R. 1600. Fleay, ii, 310.

*Club Law*, Sat'l. Com. Cambridge. Ruggle, G. 1597. See *Retros. Rev.* xii, 23.

Clyomon and Sir Clamydes, Sir, Heroical "romance." Preston, T.? 1570–84, 1599.

*Cobbler* [*of Queenheath*], *The*, Com. 1597. H. 69, 82.

Cobbler's Prophecy, The, Com. Wilson, R. Before 1593, 1594. Repr. *Jahrbuch*, xxxiii, 1897.

Cockle de Moy. See The Dutch Courtesan.

Cœlo and Olympo, Mythological Drama. Heywood, T. 1595. H. 22. Original title of The Golden Age. Fleay, i, 283.

Cœlum Britannicum, Masque. Carew, T. 1633 [4], 1634. Hazlitt, *Carew*.

Cola's Fury or Lyrenda's Misery, Hist. Trag. Birkhead, H. 1645, 1646.

Coleoverton, A Masque Presented at. Jonson, B.? (Brotanek). 1618. Repr. Brotanek, 328.

*College of Canonical Clerks*, *The*. S. R. 1567.

*Collier*, *The History of the*. 1576. Revels, 102.

Colonel, The. See The Siege. Davenant.

*Colthorpe*, *The Device of a Pageant for Martin*, *Mayor*. Peele, G. S. R. 1588.

*Columbus*, Hist. Marston, J. 1602. See Halliwell, 53; Fleay, ii, 381.

Combat of Love and Friendship, The, T. C. Mead, R. Oxford, 1636, 1654. See Fleay, ii, 85.

Come See a Wonder, Com. Day, J. Lic. 1623. Probably one with The Wonder of a Kingdom. See Fleay, *Stage*, 302.

*Come to my Country House*. See *The Crafty Merchant*.

Comedy of Errors, The. Shakespeare, W. 1589–91. Folio, 1623.

Common Conditions, Moral. of heroical type. 1570, n. d. [1576]. Repr. Brandl, *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxx, 1898.

Complaint of the Satyrs. See Althorpe, Entertainment at.

[Comus.] Ludlow Castle, Masque at. Milton, J. 1634, 1637.

Concealed Fancies, The, Com.? Lady Jane Cavendish and Lady Elizabeth Brackley. Before 1642. *Bodleian MS. Rawl. Poet.* 16.

*Conceited Duke, The.* 1639. Mentioned in Beeston's List. See Collier, ii, 92. Perhaps Shirley's The Duke. Fleay, ii, 337.

Conceited Pedlar, The, Monologue. Cambridge. Randolph, T. 1629, 1630.

*Conceits, The*, Com.? S. R. 1654.

Conference between a Gentleman Huisher and a Post, Dialog. Davies, Sir J. 1591. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 76.

Conflict of Conscience, The, Moral. Woodes, N. 1560, 1581. Dodsley, vi.

*Connan, Prince of Cornwall*, Chron. Drayton, Dekker. 1598. H. 97.

*Conquest of Brute.* See *Brute, The Conquest of.*

*Conquest of Spain by John a Gaunt, The.* Hathway, Rankins. 1601. H. 135. *Alleyn Papers*, 25.

*Conquest of the West Indies.* Haughton, Day, Smith. 1601. H. 135. *Alleyn Papers*, 23.

Conspiracy, The, or Palantus and Eudora, Trag. Killigrew, H. 1634, 1638.

Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles, Duke of Byron, The. See Byron.

Constant Maid, The, or Love will Find out the Way, Com. Shirley, J. 1637–38, 1640.

*Constantine*, Hist. 1592. H. 13.

Contention between Liberality and Prodigality, The, Moral. 1565; revised 1601, 1602. Dodsley, viii.

1, 2, Contention betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster, The First Part of the, Chron. 1590; 1594, 1595.

Contention for Honor and Riches, A, Moral Masque. Shirley, J. 1631, 1633.

Contention of Ajax and Ulysses, The, Dialog. Shirley, J. 1640. With Honoria and Mammon, 1659.

Contract Broken, A, Justly Revenged. See The Noble Soldier.

Converted Conjurer, The. See The Two Noble Ladies.

Converted Robber, The, Past. Wilde, G. Oxford, 1637. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 14047. Described, *Engl. Stud.* xxxv, 1905.

Coridon and Phyllida, Past. Dialog. Breton, N. Part of the Queen's Entertainment at Elvetham, 1591.

Coriolanus, The Tragedy of. Shakespeare, W. 1609. Folio, 1623.

Cornelia, Trag., Tr. Garnier. Kyd, T. 1592, 1594. Ed. H. Gassner, 1894.

Cornelianum Dolium, Lat. Com. Riley, T. Trinity, Cambridge, 1638. See *European Magazine*, xxxvii, 344, 439.

*Cornwall, Harry of*, Chron. 1592. H. 13.

Corona Minervæ, Masque. 1635.

Coronation, The, Com. "Fletcher." Shirley, J. Lic. 1635, 1640. See Shirley's list of his plays appended to The Cardinal, *Six New Plays*, 1653.

*Corporal, The*, Com. Wilson, A. 1630. S. R. Sept. 1646. See *dramatis personæ* printed by Feuillerat, The Swisser, 1904.

*Cosmo, The Comedy of.* 1593. H. 15.

Costly Whore, The, Pseudo-Hist. 1633. Bullen's *Old English Plays*, iv.

Country Captain, The, Com. Cavendish, W., Earl of Newcastle. 1639. Pr. with The Variety, 1649. Repr. as Captain Underwit, Bullen, *Old English Plays*, ii.

Country Girl, The, Com. "T. B." Before 1642, 1647. See *Retros. Rev.* xvi.

Country Tragedy in Vacuniam, A, or Cupid's Sacrifice. Percy, W. 1602. *Percy MS.* No. 4. See Aphrodisial.

*Countryman, The.* S. R. 1653.

Courage of Love, The. See Love and Honor.

Courageous Turk, The, or Amurath I, Trag. Goffe, T. Before 1627, 1632.

*Coursing of the Hare, The, or The Madcap*, Com. Heming, W. 1633. See Collier, *Memoirs of Actors*, 72.

Court Beggar, The, Com. Brome, R. 1640. *Five New Plays*, 1653.

*Court of Comfort, The*. 1578. *Notes and Queries*, IX, ii, 444.

Court Secret, The, T. C. Shirley, J. Before 1642. *Six New Plays*, 1653.

Covent Garden, Com. Nabbes, T. 1632, 1638.

Cowdrey, Speeches and Entertainment of the Queen at. 1591.

Cox, John, of Collumpton, Murder Play. Haughton, Day. 1599. H. 59.

Coxcomb, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1609–10. Folio, 1647.

*Crack me this Nut*, Com. 1595. H. 24.

*Cradle of Security, The*, Moral. *C.* 1570. Described by R. Willis, Mount Tabor, 1639. See Malone, iii, 28.

*Craft upon Subtilty's Back*, Intl. 1570. S. R. 1609.

*Crafty Merchant, The, or the Soldiered Citizen*, Com. Bonen, W. Lic. 1623. See Fleay, i, 32.

Creation of Prince Henry, The, Entertainment. Daniel, S. 1610.

Crede Quod Habes et Habes. See The City Nightcap.

Cripple of Fenchurch, The. See The Fair Maid of the Exchange.

Crœsus, Trag. Alexander, W., Earl of Stirling. *Monarchic Tragedies*, 1604.

Cromwell, Thomas, Lord, Chron. "W. S." 1592, 1602. Repr. as Shakespeare's, Third Folio, 1664.

Cruel Brother, The, Trag. Davenant, W. 1627, 1630.

Cruel Debtor, The, Com. "Wager, W." Extant in fragments. 1566, n. d. *New Sh. Soc.* i, 2. See *Academy*, March, 1878.

*Cruel War, The*, Trag. Pr. 1647. Halliwell, 65.

Cruelty of a Stepmother, The. 1578. Revels, 125.

*Cruelty without Lust.* See *Castara.*

*Cuckolds' Masque, The.* "Temp. Car. I." Halliwell, 66.

Cuckqueans' and Cuckolds' Errants, The, or the Bearing Down the Inn, Com. Percy, W. 1601. Roxburghe Club, 1824.

Cunning Lovers, The, Com. Brome, A. 1639, 1654.

*Cupid, Triumph of,* Masque. Howard, Sir. G. Before 1642? Halliwell, 251.

*Cupid and Psyche.* Acted 1579. "Mentioned by Gosson, *School of Abuse.*" Fleay, ii, 291.

Cupid and Psyche. See Love's Mistress.

*Cupid and Psyche.* See *The Golden Ass.*

*Cupids, Masque of.* Middleton, T. 1614.

Cupid's Banishment, Masque. White, R. 1617. Pr. Nichols, *James,* iii, 283.

Cupid's Mistress. See Love's Mistress.

Cupid's Revenge, Trag. Fletcher, J. 1608–13, 1615.

Cupid's Sacrifice. See A Country Tragedy.

*Cupid's Vagaries.* See *Hymen's Holiday.*

Cupid's Whirligig, Com. Sharpham, E. 1606, 1607.

Cure for a Cuckold, A, Com. "Webster, Rowley, W." 1617. *Two New Plays,* 1661.

Custom of the Country, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1619–22. Folio, 1647.

*Cutlack,* Trag.? 1594. H. 17.

Cutter of Coleman Street, Com. Cowley, A. 1641. Pr. as The Guardian, 1650. Grosart, *Cowley,* i.

*Cutting Dick.* 1602. H. 181.

*Cutwell.* 1576. Revels, 120.

Cymbeline, "Romance." Shakespeare, W. 1607. Folio, 1623.

*Cynocephali.* 1577. Revels, 102.

*Cynocephali, The History of.* 1577. Revels, 103.

Cynthia's Revels. Sat'l. Com. Jonson, B. 1600, 1601.

Cynthia's Revenge, or Mænander's Ecstasy, Trag. Stephens, J. Not acted, 1613.

Cyprian Conqueror, The, or the Faithless Relict, T. C.? Temp. Charles I. *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane*, 3709.

Cyrus. See The Wars of Cyrus.

Damoiselle, The, or the New Ordinary, Com. Brome, R. 1637–38. *Five New Plays*, 1653.

*Damon and Pithias*, Chettle, H. 1600. H. 118.

Damon and Pithias, Two the most faithfullest Friends, Com. Edwards, R. 1564, 1571. Dodsley, iv.

*Danish Tragedy, A.* Chettle, H. 1602. H. 169. Perhaps Hoffman.

Darius, King, Protestant Play. Revised 1563 or 1564, 1565. Brandl, *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxx, 1898.

Darius, The Tragedy of. Alexander, W., Earl of Stirling. Not acted, 1603.

David and Absalom, Bible Play. Bale, J. Declared extant in MS. by Fleay, ii, 293 and identified with the Two Sins of David. S. R. 1562.

David and Bethsabe, Biblical Chron. Peele, G. 1589, 1599.

*Dead Man's Fortune, The*, Rom. Com. Plan extant. See Malone, iii, 356.

*Death of Dido*, Masque. "R. C." 1621. Halliwell, 71.

Death, The Triumph of. See The Triumph of Death.

*Defiance of Fortune, A.* 1590. See Herford, 173.

*Delight, A Comedy called.* 1580. Revels, 167.

*Delphrygus.* Mentioned by Nash in Greene's *Menaphon*, 1589, and by Greene in *A Groatsworth of Wit*, 1592.

Demetrius and Euanthe. See The Humorous Lieutenant.

Demetrius and Marsina (Fleay), or Marina (Bates), or The Imperial Impostor and the Unhappy Heroine, Trag. "One of Warburton's MSS. not destroyed," Fleay, ii, 337. Apparently a mistake.

Deorum Judicium, Dialog. Heywood, T. Qy. one of Five Plays in One, 1597. Pleasant Dialogues, 1637.

Deposing of Richard II, The. See Richard II. Shakespeare.

Descensus Astrææ, Pageant. Peele, G. 1591, n. d.

Deserving Favourite, The, T. C. Carlell, L. 1629. Repr. *Lodowick Carliell*, C. H. Gray, 1905.

*Destruction of Jerusalem, The*, Trag. Legge, T. Acted, Coventry, 1577. Listed, 1656. Greg, ii, p. lxii.

*Devices at the Tilt Yard*. 1581. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii, 315.

Devil and his Dame, The. See Grim the Collier.

Devil is an Ass, The, Com. Jonson, B. 1616. Folio II, 1631–40.

*Devil of Dowgate, The, or Usury Put to Use*, Com. Lic. Oct. 1623. Identified by Fleay with Wit at Several Weapons and also with *Buck is a Thief*.

Devil's Charter, The, or the Tragedy of Pope Alexander VI. Barnes, B. 1606, 1607. Ed. R. B. McKerrow, *Materialien zur Kunde*, vi, 1904.

Devil's Law Case, The, Com. Webster, J. 1619, 1623.

Diana's Grove or the Faithful Genius. Before 1603. MS. extant "in private hands." Fleay, ii, 337.

Diccon of Bedlam. See Gammer Gurton's Needle.

Dick of Devonshire, T. C. Variously attributed to Heywood and to Shirley. 1625. Bullen, *Old English Plays*, ii, 188.

*Dido*, Lat. Trag. Halliwell, E. Acted, Cambridge, 1564. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 245.

Dido, Lat. Trag. Gager, W. Oxford, 1583, 1592. Repr. Dyce's *Marlowe*, Appendix.

*Dido and Æneas*. 1598. H. 83.

Dido, Queen of Carthage, The Tragedy of. Marlowe, Nash. 1591, 1594.

*Diocletian*. 1594. H. 20.

Discontented Colonel, The. (Brennoralt in later collected editions.) See Brennoralt.

Discreet Lover, The. See The Fool would be Favorite.

*Disguises*, Com.? 1595. H. 25.

Disobedient Child, The, Intl., Tr. Textor. Ingelend, T. Before 1560, n. d. [1561–75]. Dodsley, ii.

Distracted Emperor, The. See Charlemagne.

Distracted State, The, Trag. Pseudo-Hist. Tatham, J. 1641, 1651.

Distressed Lovers, The. See Double Falsehood.

Distresses, The. See The Spanish Lovers.

*Dives and Lazarus*, Dialog. 1560. Mentioned in the play of Sir Thomas More and in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit.*

*Divorce, The.* S. R. 1654.

Dixie, Woolstone, Pageant before. Peele, G. 1585.

Doctor Dodypoll. See The Wisdom of Doctor Dodypoll.

Doctor Faustus. See Faustus.

Don Horatio. See The Spanish Tragedy.

*Don Quixote, The Comical History of*, Com. Advertised in 1658.

Double Falsehood, or the Distressed Lovers, T. C. Shirley, J.? Before 1642. Pr. by Theobald as by "Shakespeare," 1728. See Genest, iii, 203.

Double Marriage, The, Trag. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1620. Folio, 1647.

*Double Masque, A.* 1578. Revels, 135.

Doubtful Heir, The, T. C., Pseudo-Hist. Shirley, J. 1640. *Six New Plays*, 1653.

2, *Dough, Thomas.* 1601. H. 145. No first part mentioned.

*Duchess of Fernandina*, Trag. Glapthorne, H. *C.* 1639. Warburton.

Duchess of Malfi, The, Trag. Webster, J. 1617, 1623. Ed. M. W. Sampson, 1906.

Duchess of Suffolk, The, Chron. Drue, T. 1624, 1631.

*Duke, The*, T. C.? Shirley, J. Lic. 1631. Qy. The Humorous Courtier.

*Duke Humphrey*, Trag. "By W. Shakespeare." S. R. June, 1660. Warburton. Perhaps 2, Henry VI.

*Duke of Guise, The*, Hist. Shirley, H. Before 1627. Lic. 1653.

Duke of Milan, The, Trag. Massinger, P. 1620, 1623.

*Duke of Milan, The, and the Marquis of Mantua.* 1579. Revels, 154.

Duke's Mistress, The, T. C. Shirley, J. 1636, 1638.
*Dumb Bawd, The*, Com.? Shirley, H. Before 1627. S. R. 1653.
Dumb Knight, The, Rom. Com. Markham, G., Machin, L. 1607, 1608. Dodsley, x.
*Duns Furens*, Sat'l. Com. Nash, T. Before 1596. See *Have With You to Saffron Walden*, p. 117.
Durance, Masque. "Temp. Car. I." Halliwell, 80.
Dutch Courtesan, The, Com. Marston, J. 1604, 1605.
*Dutch Painter, The, and the French Branke.* Lic. 1623–24. Fleay, ii, 326, queries Doctor Dodypoll.

*Earl Godwin.* See *Godwin.*
*Earl of Gloucester.* See *Gloucester.*
*Earl of Hereford.* See *Hereford.*
Eastward Hoe, Com. Man. Chapman, Jonson, Marston. 1604, 1605. Ed. *Belles Lettres Dramatists*, 1905.
*Ebrank, King.* Acted, Chester, 1589. R. Morris, *Chester in the Plantagenet and Tudor Reigns*, 1893, p. 322.
Edinburgh, Entertainment of King Charles into. 1633.
Edmund Ironside or War hath Made all Friends. Before 1642? *Brit. Mus. MS. Egerton*, 1994.
Edward I, The Famous Chronicle of King. Peele, G. 1590–91, 1593.
Edward II, The Troublesome Reign and Lamentable Death of, Chron. Trag. Marlowe, C. 1592, 1594.
Edward III, The Reign of King, Chron. Variously attributed to Marlowe, Shakespeare, and Lodge. 1590–96, 1596.
1, 2, Edward IV, Chron. Heywood, T. 1594, 1600.
Edwardus Confessor, Sanctus, Lat. Hist. Before 1625. *Bibl. Heber.* xi, 113; Halliwell, 219.
*Egio*, Intl. 1560. Halliwell, 82.
*Eight Ladies, Masque of.* June, 1600. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 498.
Elder Brother, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. Revised 1626, 1637.

Elizabeth, Queen, and the French Ambassadors, The Shews, etc., before. Goldwell, H. 1581, n. d.

Elizabeth, Queen, Troubles of. See If You Know Not Me.

Elvetham, Entertainment to the Queen at. In part by Breton, N. 1591.

Emperor of the East, The, Hist. T. C. Massinger, P. 1631, 1632.

Enchiridion Christiados, Masque. Cayworth, J. 1636. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10311.

Endimion, the Man in the Moon, Court Com. Lyly, J. 1585, 1591.

England's Comfort and London's Joy, Entertainment. Taylor, J. 1641.

England's Farewell, Entertainment. Roberts, H. 1606.

England's Joy, a Dumb Show. Vennar, R. Acted, 1602. See *Harleian Miscellany*, ed. 1813, vol. x.

*English Fugitives, The.* Haughton, W. 1600. H. 120.

English Moor, The, or the Mock Marriage, Com. Brome, R. 1636–37. *Five New Plays*, 1659.

English Traveller, The, Dom. Com. Heywood, T. 1632, 1633.

Englishmen for my Money, or a Woman will have her Will, Com. Haughton, W. 1598, 1616. Dodsley, x.

*Enough is as Good as a Feast.* Listed, 1656, 1671. Greg, ii, p. lxvi.

Entertainment at the Earl of Newcastle's. Jonson, B. 1620. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10444. See Fleay, ii, 12, 343.

Entertainment to King James, An. Dekker, Middleton. See Ward, ii, 466.

Epicœne or the Silent Woman, Com. Man. Jonson, B. 1609, 1612 (Gifford). Folio, 1616.

*Error, The History of.* 1577. Revels, 102.

Errors, Comedy of. See The Comedy of Errors.

*Essex Antic Masque. C.* 1620. Halliwell, 88.

*Ethiopians, The.* 1578. *Notes and Queries*, IX, ii, 444.

Eunuch, The, Tr. Terence. Newman, T. The Two First Comedies of Terence, 1627.

Eunuch, The. See The Fatal Contract.
Eunuchus, Tr. Bernard, R. Terence in English, 1598.
Euphormus sive Cupido Adultus, Lat. Wilde, G. St. John's, Oxford, 1635. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 14047.
*Eurialus and Lucretia.* S. R. 1630 and 1683. Entered as by "Shakespeare." Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines*, ii, 414.
Euribates Pseudomagus. Lat. Cruso, A. After 1610. *Cambridge, MS. Emmanuel Coll.* 3. 1. 17. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 318.
Every Man in his Humor, Com. Jonson, B. 1598, 1601.
Every Man out of his Humor, Com. Jonson, B. 1599, 1600.
Every Woman in her Humor, Com. Before 1600, 1609. Bullen's *Old Plays*, iv.
1, 2, *Evoradanus, Prince of Denmark.* S. R. 1605. Arber, iii, 120.
Example, The, Com. Man. Shirley, J. 1634, 1637.
Exchange Ware at The Second Hand. See Band, Cuff, and Ruff.
*Exposure, The.* Lic. 1598. *Biog. Dram.* ii, 209.
*Ezechias*, Bible Play. Udall, N. Cambridge, 1564. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 186.

*Fabii, The.* Mentioned by Gosson, *Plays Confuted*, 1582. See *Four Sons of Fabius.*
*Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo, The*, Com. Fletcher, Massinger. Lic. 1640. S. R. 1653.
1, *Fair Constance of Rome.* Munday, Drayton, Hathway, Wilson, Dekker. 1600. H. 122. *Alleyn Papers*, 26.
2, *Fair Constance of Rome.* Hathway, R. 1600. H. 122.
Fair Em, the Miller's Daughter of Manchester, with the Love of William the Conqueror. Before 1590, 1631. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, 1878, ii.
Fair Favourite, The, T. C. Davenant, Sir W. 1638. Folio, 1673.
*Fair Foul One, The*, Com.? Smith, William. Lic. 1623.
Fair Maid of Bristow, The, Dom. Com. 1602, 1605. Ed. A. H. Quinn, *Publ. Univ. of Penna.* 1902.

Fair Maid of Clifton. See The Vow Breaker.

*Fair Maid of Italy.* 1594. H. 16.

Fair Maid of the Exchange, The, Com. Heywood, T.? 1602, 1607. Ed. B. Field, *Sh. Soc.* 1845.

Fair Maid of the Inn, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. Lic. 1626. Folio, 1647.

1, 2, Fair Maid of the West, The, or a Girl Worth Gold, Com. Travel. Heywood, T. Before 1603, 1631.

Fair Quarrel, A, Com. Man. Middleton, Rowley, W. 1616, 1617.

*Fair Spanish Captive, The,* T. C. Advertised, 1658.

*Fair Star of Antwerp, The,* Trag. Lic. 1624.

*Fairy Knight, The.* Dekker, Ford. Lic. 1624.

*Fairy Masque, The. C.* 1620. Halliwell, 91.

Fairy Pastoral, The, or Forest of Elves, Past. Percy, W. 1601. Pr. by J. Haslewood, 1824.

*Fairy Queen, The,* Com.? Before 1642? Warburton.

Faithful Friends, The, T. C. "By Beaumont and Fletcher." S. R. June, 1660. Daborne, R.? 1614. Ed. Weber, 1812.

Faithful Shepherd, The. See Pastor Fido, Il.

Faithful Shepherdess, The, Past. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1608, 1629.

Fallacy or the Troubles of the Great Hermenia, Allegorical. Zouch, R. 1631. *Brit. Mus. MS. Harl.* 6869.

False One, The, Roman Hist. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1620. Folio, 1647.

Falstaff, Sir John. See The Merry Wives of Windsor.

Fame and Honor, The Triumph of, Civic Pageant. Taylor, J. 1634.

Family of Love, The, Com. Man. Middleton, T. 1607, 1608.

Famous Victories of Henry V, The. See Henry V. Tarlton.

*Famous Wars of Henry I and the Prince of Wales.* See *Henry I.*

Fancies Chaste and Noble, The, Com. Ford, J. 1635, 1638.

*Fatal Brothers, The,* Trag. Davenport, R. 1625–36. S. R. June, 1660.

Fatal Contract, The, a French Tragedy. Heming, W. 1637, 1653.

Fatal Dowry, The, Trag. Massinger, Field. 1619, 1632.

*Fatal Friendship, The*, Trag. Burroughs. S. R. 1646.

*Fatal Love, The*, "A French Tragedy by Chapman, G." Before 1634. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

Fatal Marriage, The, or a Second Lucretia, Rom. Trag. Before 1642. *Brit. Mus. MS. Egerton*, 1994. See Bullen, *Old Plays*, ii, 425.

Fatal Union, The. See Sicily and Naples.

*Father's Own Son.* Mentioned in Beeston's List, 1639. Collier, ii, 92.

Fatum Vortigerni, Lat. Trag. Before 1600. *Brit. Mus. MS. Lansdowne*, 723. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 254.

*Fault in Friendship, A*, Com. Brome, R., Jonson, B., Jr. Lic. 1623.

Faustus, Doctor, Trag. Marlowe, C. 1588, 1604.

Fawn, The. See Parasitaster.

*Feast and Welcome*, Com. Massinger, P. Before 1640. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

*Felix and Philomena.* 1584. Revels, 189.

Female Rebellion, The, Com. Before 1642. Pr. by A. Smith, Glasgow, 1872.

*Femelanco*, Trag. Chettle, "Robinson." 1602. H. 170.

*Ferrar, A History of.* 1583. Revels, 177. Qy. *The History of Error.*

Ferrex and Porrex. See Gorboduc.

*Ferrex and Porrex.* Haughton, W. 1600. H. 119.

Fidele and Fortunatus. See Two Italian Gentlemen. Cf. Greg, ii, pp. lxviii, cxxvii.

Filli di Sciro, Tr. Bonarelli. Sidnam, J. 1630? 1655. See Greg, *Pastoral*, 248.

Fine Companion, A, Com. Marmion, S. 1633.

*Fishers' Masque.* 1572. Revels, 34.

*Five Plays in One.* 1585. Revels, 189.

*Five Plays in One.* 1597. H. 51.

Fleire, The, Com. Man. Sharpham, E. 1606, 1607.

Floating Island, The, T. C. Strode, W. 1636, 1655. Ed. B. Dobell, 1907.

Florence, The Great Duke of. See The Great Duke.

Florimene, a Pastoral in French. Lic. 1635. See Malone, iii, 122 n.

Flowers, The Masque of. 1614. Repr. Evans, 1887.

*Flying Voice, The*, "a play, by R. Wood." Warburton. See *Gentleman's Mag.* ii, 220.

*Fool and her Maidenhead soon Parted, A*, Com. Davenport, R. 1625. Beeston's List. S. R. Nov. 1663.

Fool would be a Favourite, The, or the Discreet Lover, T. C. Carlell, L. 1638. *Two New Plays*, 1657.

*Fool's Masque, The. C.* 1620. Halliwell, 100.

*Fool Transformed, The*, Com. Advertised, 1658. See *ibid.*

*Fool Without Book, The.* Rowley, W. S. R. 1653. See *ibid.*

*Forced Lady, The.* See *Minerva's Sacrifice.*

*Foresters' or Hunters' Masque, The.* 1574. Revels, 53.

Fortunate Isles and their Union, The, Masque. Jonson, B. 1624, n. d.

1, *Fortunatus*, Folklore Drama. 1596. H. 28. See Old Fortunatus.

*Fortune, Play of.* 1572. Revels, 36.

Fortune by Land and Sea, Com. Heywood, T., Rowley, W. 1607, 1655.

*Fortune's Tennis.* Dekker, T. 1600. H. 124.

*Fount of New Fashions, The*, Com. Chapman, G. 1598. H. 96.

Fountain of Self-Love, The. See Cynthia's Revels.

*Four Honored Loves, The Book of*, Com. "Rowley, W." S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

*Four Kings, The.* 1599. H. 103.

*Four Plays in One.* 1592. H. 13. Qy. Sir Clyomon. Fleay, ii, 296. See *The Seven Deadly Sins.*

Four Plays in One. See Triumphs of Honor, of Love, of Death, of Time.

Four Prentices of London, The, Heroical Rom. Heywood, T. 1594, 1615.

Four Seasons, Masque of the. Before 1625. *Sh. Soc.* 1848.

*Four Sons of Aymon*, Heroical Rom. 1602. H. 173. See Heywood's *Apology*, 40, 58.

*Four Sons of Fabius, The*. 1580. Revels, 154.

Fox, The. See Volpone.

Fraus Honesta, Lat. Com. Stubbe, P. Trinity, Cambridge, 1616, 1632.

Fraus Pia, Lat. Com.? Before 1642? *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane*, 1855.

*Frederick and Basilea*, Rom. Drama? 1597. H. 53. See "platte," Malone, iii, 357.

*Freeman's Honor, The*, Com.? Smith, William. 1614. Mentioned in Dedication of The Hector of Germany.

Freewill, A certain Tragedy entituled, Tr. Bassano. Cheke, H. 1561, n. d.

Freewill, King, Tr. Bassano. Bristowe, F. 1635. *Biog. Dram.* i, 68.

*French Comedy*. 1595. H. 21.

*French Doctor*, Com.? 1594. H. 19.

*French Schoolmaster*. Advertised, 1662. Halliwell, 104.

Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, Com. Greene, R. 1589, 1594.

*Friar Fox and Gillian of Brentford*, Com. Rowley, S. 1599. H. 102.

*Friar Francis*. 1594. H. 16.

*Friar Rush and the Proud Woman of Antwerp*, Com. Day, Haughton. 1601. H. 143.

*Friar Spendleton*, or *Pendleton*. 1597. H. 54.

Fucus sive Histriomastix, Lat. Com.? Before 1642. *Bodleian MS.*

Fuimus Troes, or the True Trojans, Chron. Fisher, J. 1625, 1633. Dodsley, xii.

*Fulgius and Lucrell*, Com. Advertised, 1656. Greg, ii, p. lxx.

*Furies Masque, The*. *C.* 1624. Halliwell, 105.

*Galfrido and Bernardo.* H. 22. A forgery. See Greg, *ibid.* p. xxxviii.

*Galiaso.* 1594. H. 17.

Gallant Cavaliero Dick Bowyer, This. See Trial of Chivalry.

Gallathea, Court Drama. Lyly, J. 1584, 1592.

Game at Chess, A, Political Satire. Middleton, T. 1624, 1625.

*Game of Cards, A Comedy or Moral devised on a.* 1582. Revels, 176.

Gamester, The. Shirley, J. Lic. 1633, 1637.

Gammer Gurton's Needle, Dom. Com. Stevenson, W. 1552–53, 1575. Dodsley, iii.

*Garlic*, Sat'l. Com. 1612 or 1613. Mentioned in The Hog hath Lost his Pearl, 1614, and elsewhere.

General, The, T. C. 1638? Pr. 1853. Halliwell, 106.

Gentle Craft, The. See The Shoemakers' Holiday.

Gentleman of Venice, The, T. C. Shirley, J. Lic. 1639, 1655.

Gentleman Usher, The, Com. Intrigue. Chapman, G. 1601 or 1602, 1606.

George a Greene, or the Pinner of Wakefield, Com. Greene, R. 1588–92, 1599.

Gesta Grayorum, Entertainment, by various hands. 1594–95, 1688. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii, 262–352.

Ghost, The, or the Woman Wears the Breeches, Com. 1640, 1653. See Genest, x, 111.

*Gillian of Brentford and Friar Fox.* See *Friar Fox.*

Gipsies, The Masque of. Jonson, B. 1621. *Horace, Art of Poetry*, 1640.

Gipsies' Metamorphosis, The. See Gipsies, The Masque of.

*Giraldo, the Constant Lover.* Shirley, H. Before 1627. S. R. 1653.

Girl Worth Gold, A. See The Fair Maid of the West.

Gismond of Salern, Trag. Wilmot, R., and others. 1568. Pr. as Tancred and Gismunda, 1591.

*Give a Man Luck and Throw Him into the Sea.* S. R. 1600.

Glass of Government, The, School Drama, Tr. from Dutch? Gascoigne, G. 1573, 1575. Hazlitt, *Gascoigne*, ii.

*Gloucester, Earl of, Life of the Humorous.* Wadeson, A. 1601. H. 133.

Goblins, The, Com. Suckling, Sir J. 1638. *Fragmenta Aurea*, 1646.

*God Speed the Plough*, Com.? 1593. H. 16. S. R. 1601.

2, *Godfrey of Boulogne*, Pseudo-Hist. 1594. H. 18. No first part is mentioned, unless it be *Jerusalem.*

Godly Queen Hester. See Hester.

1, 2, *Godwin, Earl, and his Three Sons*, Chron. Drayton, Dekker, Chettle, Wilson. 1598. H. 85, 86.

Golden Age, The. Heywood, T. 1595, 1611.

Golden Age Restored, The, Masque. Jonson, B. 1615. Folio, 1616.

*Golden Ass, The, and Cupid and Psyche.* Dekker, Day, Chettle. 1600. H. 120.

Goosecap, Sir Giles, Com. Man. Chapman, G.? 1601, 1606. Bullen, *Old Plays*, iii.

Gorboduc, Trag. Norton, T., Sackville, T. 1562, 1565. Manly, ii.

Gossips' Brawl, The, Dom. Farce. Before 1640? 1654.

*Governor, The*, Trag. Formido, Sir C. 1637 (Collier, ii, 80). S. R. 1653. Warburton.

*Gowry*, Trag. 1604. Mentioned by J. Chamberlain. Fleay, ii, 329.

Grateful Servant, The, Com. Shirley, J. Lic. 1629, 1630.

Gray's Inn, The Masque of. Marston, J.? 1618. Ed. Collier in *Sh. Soc.* 1848. See Brotanek, 355.

Great Duke of Florence, The, T. C. Massinger, P. Lic. 1627, 1636.

*Great Man, The*, Trag. 1625–42. Warburton.

*Grecian Comedy, The.* 1594. H. 20.

*Greek Maid, A Pastoral or History of a.* 1579. Revels, 125. Perhaps one with Peele's *Mahomet and Hiren the Fair Greek.*

*Greeks and Trojans*, Trag.? 1625–42. Mentioned, E. Gayton, *Festivous Notes on Don Quixote*, 1654, p. 271.

Greene's Tu Quoque, or the City Gallant, Com. Cooke, J. 1609–12, 1614. Dodsley, xi.

Grim the Collier of Croydon, or the Devil and his Dame, Com. "By J. T." Haughton, W.? 1600. *Gratiæ Theatrales*, 1662. Dodsley, viii.

Grobiana's Nuptials, Com.? Before 1642? *Bodleian MS.* 30. Halliwell, 112.

Guardian, The. See Cutter of Coleman Street.

Guardian, The, Com. Massinger, P. Lic. 1633. *Three New Plays*, 1655.

*Guelphs and Ghibbelines*, Trag.? 1625–42. Mentioned, E. Gayton, *Festivous Notes on Don Quixote*, 1654, p. 271.

*Guido*, Hist.? 1597. H. 51.

*Guise, The*, Trag. 1593. H. 15.

*Guise, The*, Hist. Webster, J. 1619. Alluded to in Introd. to The Devil's Law Case, 1623.

*Gustavus, King of Swedland*, Hist. Dekker, T. Before 1640. S. R. 1660. Warburton.

Guy, Earl of Warwick, Heroical Rom. "Day and Dekker," S. R. 1620, 1639. "By B. J." Ed. 1661.

*Gynæcocratia*, Com. Puttenham, G. Before 1589. *Art of Poesie*, ed. Arber, 146–148.

Haddington, Viscount, Masque at the Marriage of. Jonson, B. 1608, n. d.

*Hamlet*, Trag. Kyd, T. 1588–89. Mentioned in Nash's preface to Greene's *Menaphon*, 1589; by Lodge in *Wit's Misery*, 1592; by H. 17, 1594, and elsewhere.

Hamlet, Prince of Denmark, The Tragical History of. Shakespeare, W. 1602, 1603.

Hamlet, Prinz, aus Dännemark. See Bestrafte Brudermord, Der.

Hampton Court, Royal Masque at. See The Vision of the Twelve Goddesses.

*Hannibal and Hermes, or Worse 'feared than Hurt.* Wilson, Drayton, Dekker. 1598. H. 90.

*Hannibal and Scipio.* Hathway, Rankins. 1601. H. 60.

Hannibal and Scipio. Nabbes, T. 1635, 1637.

Hans Beer-Pot, Dialog. Belchier, D. 1618.

*Hard Shift for Husbands, or Bilboe's the Best Blade,* Com.? Rowley, W. or S.? Lic. Oct. 1623.

*Hardiknute,* or *Canute,* Chron. 1597. H. 54.

Harfield, Devise to entertain her Majesty at. 1602. *Sh. Soc. Papers,* ii, 67.

*Harry of Cornwall,* Chron. 1591. H. 13.

*Hatfield, Masque for the Princess Elizabeth at.* 1556. Nichols, *Elizabeth,* i, 16.

Hay, Lord, Masque at the House of. See Lovers made Men.

Hayes, Masque at the Marriage of Lord. See Whitehall.

*Haymakers' Masque, The. C.* 1623. Halliwell, 114.

Health and Prosperity, The Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1626.

Heautontimoroumenos, Tr. Bernard, R. Terence in English, 1598.

Hector of Germany, The, Pseudo-Hist. Smith, Wentworth. *C.* 1613, 1615. Ed. L. W. Payne, 1906.

Hecyra, Tr. Bernard, R. Terence in English. 1598.

Heir, The, Com. May, T. 1620, 1622. Dodsley, xi.

*Heliogabalus, The Life and Death of.* S. R. June, 1594.

Helmet, The Masque of the. 1594–95. *Gesta Grayorum,* 1688.

Hengist, or Henges, Chron. 1597. H. 53. Revised by Middleton as The Mayor of Quinborough.

*Henry I, Life and Death of,* Chron. 1597. H. 53. S. R. 1597.

*Henry I, The History of.* Davenport, R. Lic. 1624.

*Henry I and Henry II.* "By Shakespeare and Davenport." S. R. 1653. Warburton.

*Henry I and the Prince of Wales, Famous Wars of.* Drayton, Dekker, Chettle. 1598. H. 85.

1, Henry IV, The History of, Chron. Shakespeare, W. 1597, 1598.

2, Henry IV, The Second Part of, Chron. Shakespeare, W. 1598, 1600.

Henry V, The Chronicle History of. Shakespeare, W. 1599, 1600.

*Henry V.* 1595. H. 27.

Henry V, The Famous Victories of, Chron. Tarlton, R. 1585–88, 1598. Facsimile quarto ed. 1887.

1, Henry VI, Chron. Greene, Peele, Marlowe, Shakespeare. 1590. Folio, 1623.

2, Henry VI, Chron. Revision by Shakespeare, W. 1591–92. Folio, 1623.

3, Henry VI, Chron. Revision by Shakespeare, W. 1591–92. Folio, 1623.

Henry VI. 1591. H. 13. Doubtless 1, Henry VI.

Henry VIII, The Famous History of the Life of King. Shakespeare, W. 1604 or 1612–13. Folio, 1623.

Henry VIII, The Famous Chronicle History of. See When You See Me.

2, *Henry Richmond.* 1599. H. 113. No first part is mentioned.

Henry's Barriers, Prince, Speeches at. Jonson, B. 1610. Folio, 1616.

1, Hercules. 1595. H. 22. One with The Silver Age. Fleay, i, 283; ii, 303.

2, Hercules. 1595. H. 24. One with The Brazen Age. Fleay, i, 284; ii, 304. M. Slater's part in these plays was doubtless that of agent.

Hercules Furens, Tr. Heywood, Jasper. 1561. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

Hercules Œtæus, Tr. Studley, J. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

*Hereford, Earl of*, Chron. 1602. H. 170.

*Hermophus*, Lat. Com. Wilde, G. Oxford. *C.* 1635.

Herod and Antipater, Trag. Chron. Markham, G., Sampson, W. 1621, 1622.

*Herodes*, Lat. Trag. Adamson, P. *C.* 1572. Fleay, i, 23.

Herodes, Lat. Trag. Goldingham, W. 1567. MS. University Library, Cambridge.

Heroes, The Masque of. See Inner Temple Masque. Middleton.

Heroic Lover, The, or the Infanta of Spain, Trag. Cartwright, G. Before 1642? 1661.

*Herpetulus, the Blue Knight, and Perobia.* 1574. Revels, 51.

Hester, Godly Queen, Bible Hist. 1525–1529? 1561. Ed. Greg, *Materialien zur Kunde*, v, 1904.

*Hester and Ahasuerus.* 1594. H. 17. Qy. Godly Queen Hester. Fleay, ii, 300.

Hey for Honesty. See Plutophthalmia Plutogamia.

Highgate, Entertainment of the King and Queen at ["Penates"]. Jonson, B. 1604. Folio, 1616.

*Highway to Heaven, The*, Moral. Mentioned in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, 1592.

Himatia-Poleos, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1614.

Hippolytus, Tr. Studley, J. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

Hispanus, Lat. Com. Morrel. Cambridge, 1596. *Bodleian MS. Douce*, 234.

Histriomastix, or the Player Whipt, Sat'l. Medley. Revised by Marston, J.? Before 1599, 1610. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, ii.

*Hit Nail o' the Head*, Intl. *C.* 1560. Mentioned in Sir Thomas More.

Hoffman, The Tragedy of. Chettle, H. H. 173. 1602, 1631. Ed. R. Ackermann, 1894.

Hog hath Lost his Pearl, The, Sat'l. Com. Tailor, R. 1613, 1614. Dodsley, xi.

Hollander, The, Com. Man. Glapthorne, H. 1635, 1640.

Holland's Leaguer, Com. Man. Marmion, S. 1632.

*Holophernes, The Play of.* Hatfield, 1556. Revived, 1572. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 16.

Homo, Lat. Trag. Atkinson, T. Cambridge, 1612. *MS. Harl.* 6925.

Honest Lawyer, The, Dom. Com. "By S. S." 1615, 1616.

Honest Man's Fortune, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Daborne, Field, Massinger. 1613. Folio, 1647.

Honest Man's Revenge, The. See The Atheist's Tragedy.

1, Honest Whore, The, Dom. Com. Dekker, Middleton. 1604.

2, Honest Whore, The, Dom. Com. Dekker, Middleton. 1604 or 1608, 1630.

Honor, The Triumph of. See The Triumph of Honor.

Honor and Industry, The Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1617.

Honor and Virtue, The Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1622.

Honor of Wales, For the, Antimasque. Jonson, B. 1618. Addition to Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue, Folio, 1640.

*Honor of Women, The*, Com. Massinger, P. Lic. May, 1628. Warburton. See Fleay, i, 223.

Honor Triumphant, Barriers. Ford, J. 1606. Repr. *Sh. Soc.* 1843.

Honoria and Mammon. See A Contention for Honor and Riches.

Honor's Academy, or the Famous Pastoral of the Fair Shepherdess Julietta, Tr. Montreux. Tofte, R. 1610.

Horestes, An Interlude of Vice Concerning. Pickering, J. 1567.

Hospital of Lovers, The, Com. Oxford, 1636. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 14047.

*Hot Anger Soon Cold*, Com.? Porter, Chettle, Jonson. 1598. H. 93.

How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad, Com. Man. "Cooke, Joshua." Heywood, T.? 1602. Dodsley, ix.

*How a Man May Please his Wife.* See *The Way to Content all Women.*

*How to Learn a Woman to Woo*, Com. Heywood, T. 1604. Perhaps The Wise Woman of Hogsdon, Fleay, i, 291. Revels, 205, of doubtful authenticity.

[Hue and Cry after Cupid, The.] See Haddington, Viscount, Masque at the Marriage of.

*Humor*, or *Honor in the End*. S. R. 1624. See *Wit and Drollery*, 1661.

Humor out of Breath, Com. Day, J. Lic. and pr. 1608. *Nero and other Plays*, Mermaid ed. 1888.

Humorous Courtier, The, Com. Shirley, J. 1631, 1640.

Humorous Day's Mirth, A, Com. Man. Chapman, G. 1597–98, 1599.

Humorous Lieutenant, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1619. Folio, 1647.

*Humors, The Comedy of*. 1597. H. 52. Qy. Chapman's Humorous Day's Mirth.

Humors Reconciled. See The Magnetic Lady.

*Hungarian Lion, The*, Hist.? Gunnell, R. Lic. 1623.

*Hunters' Masque*. See *Foresters' or Hunters' Masque*.

Hunting of Cupid, The, Court Drama fragments. Peele, G. S. R. 1591. See Bullen, *Peele*, i, p. xxviii.

Huntington, Robert Earl of, Death and Downfall of. See Robert, Earl of Huntington.

*Huon of Bordeaux*, Romance. 1593. H. 16.

Hyde Park, Com. Shirley, J. Lic. 1632, 1637.

Hymenæi, Masque. Jonson, B. 1606.

Hymenæus, Lat. Com. 1580. Pr. 1631 (non extant?). MS. Caius Coll. Cambridge, 125. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 287.

*Hymen's Holiday or Cupid's Vagaries*, Com. Rowley, W. 1612. Revels, 211.

Hymen's Triumph, Past. T. C. Daniel, S. 1614, 1615.

*Idol of a Woman, The*. Chapman, G. 1595. H. 88. Qy. A Woman's Tears.

Ieronimo, The First Part of, Pseudo-Hist. 1602, 1605. Not by Kyd. Boas, *Kyd*, 1901.

If it be not Good, the Devil is in it, Moral Com. Dekker, T. 1610, 1612.

1, 2, If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody, Chron. Heywood, T. 1604–05; 1605, 1606.

Ignoramus, Lat. Com. Ruggle, G. Cambridge, 1615, 1630. See Hazlitt, 113.

Ignoramus, Com., Tr. Ruggle. Coddington, R. 1662. *Biog. Dram.* ii, 318.

*Ill Beginning has a Good End, An*, Com. Ford, J. Before 1640. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

Impatient Poverty, Intl. S. R. 1560.

Imperial Impostor, The. See Demetrius and Marsina.

Imperiale, Senecan Trag. Freeman, Sir R. Not acted, 1639. Forthcoming ed. by C. C. Gumm, Pennsylvania Thesis.

Impossible Dowry, The. See Amyntas. Randolph.

Imposture, The, T. C. Shirley, J. Lic. 1640. *Six New Plays*, 1653.

Inconstant Lady, The, Com. Wilson, A. 1633. Ed. P. Bliss, 1814.

Inner Temple and Gray's Inn Masque, The. Beaumont, F. 1613, n. d. [1613]. Nichols, *James*, ii, 589.

Inner Temple Masque, The. Browne, W. 1615. Hazlitt's *Browne*, 1868, vol. ii, 239. Also called Ulysses and Circe.

Inner Temple Masque, The, or Masque of Heroes. Middleton, T. 1619.

Insatiate Countess, The, Trag. Marston, J. [Barkstead, W.?] 1610–13, 1613.

Integrity, The Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1623.

*Invisible Knight, The.* Before 1633. Mentioned in Shirley's *Bird in a Cage*, ii, 1.

*Iphigenia*, Tr. Euripides. Lat.? Peele, G. *C.* 1576. Oxford.

*Iphigenia*, Trag. 1571. Revels, 13.

Iphigenia in Aulis, Tr. English. Lumley, Lady J. 1576–77. *Brit. Mus. MS. Royal*, 15 a, ix, f. 63.

*Iphis and Ianthe.* "Shakespeare." S. R. 1660.

*Ira seu Tumulus Fortunæ*, Masque. See The Christmas Prince, 1607.

Irenes Trophæa, Tes, Civic Pageant. Squire, J. 1620.
*Irish Knight, The.* 1577. Revels, 114.
Irish Masque, The. Jonson, B. 1613. Folio, 1616.
*Irish Rebellion, The*, Hist. Kirke, J. Lic. 1642.
1, 2, Iron Age, The, Dramatized Myth. Heywood, T. 1596, 1632.
Island Princess, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1621. Folio, 1647.
*Isle of Dogs, The*, Sat'l. Com. Nash, T. 1597, not printed. See Nash, *Lenten Stuff*, 1599. H. 62.
Isle of Gulls, The, Com. Day, J. 1605, 1606. Bullen, *Day*, i.
*Italian Nightpiece, The.* See *The Unfortunate Piety.*
*Italian Tragedy, The.* Day, Smith. 1600. H. 117, 190.

*Jack and Gill*, Com.? 1567–68. Mentioned, *Harl. MS.* 146. Collier, i, 194.
Jack Drum's Entertainment, Dom. Com. Marston, J. 1600, 1601. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, ii.
Jack Juggler, Intl. 1553–58, n. d. [1562–69]. Dodsley, ii.
Jack Straw, The Life and Death of, Chron. 1587, 1593. Dodsley, v.
Jacob and Esau, History of, Biblical Intl. Before 1558, 1568. Dodsley, ii.
James IV, The Scottish History of, Pseudo-Chron. Greene, R. 1590, 1598.
James, King, his Entertainment in passing to his Coronation. Jonson, B. 1604.
Jane Grey, Lady. See Lady Jane Grey.
*Janus, Masque of.* 1573. Revels, 35.
*Jealous Comedy, The.* 1593. H. 15. By some believed to be The Merry Wives of Windsor. Fleay, i, 298.
Jealous Lovers, The. Randolph, T. Acted and printed, 1632.
*Jephthah.* Munday, Dekker. 1602. H. 166
Jeronimo. See Ieronimo.
*Jerusalem.* 1592. H. 13. See Fleay, ii, 302.

*Jew, The*, Com.? Before 1579. Mentioned, Gosson, *School of Abuse*, 30.

Jew of Malta, The Rich, Trag. Marlowe, C. 1589–90, 1633.

*Jeweler of Amsterdam, The.* Fletcher, Field, Massinger. *C.* 1619. S. R. 1654. Fleay, i, 202.

*Jewish Gentleman, The*, Com.? Brome, R. S. R. 1640.

Jews' Tragedy, The. Heming, W. *C.* 1638, 1662.

*Joan as Good as my Lady*, Com.? Heywood, T. 1599. H. 102.

*Job, The History of.* Greene, R. Before 1592. Warburton? Not in S. R. 1594.

*Jocanda and Astolfo*, Com. Dekker, T. S. R. 1660. Warburton.

Jocasta, Tr. Dolci, Senecan Trag. Gascoigne, G. 1566. *A Hundreth Sundry Flowers*, 1572. Ed. J. W. Cunliffe, 1906.

John, King, The Life and Death of, Chron. Shakespeare, W. 1591–92. Folio, 1623.

1, 2, John, King of England, The Troublesome Reign of, Chron. 1588, 1591. Facsimile quarto, ed. 1888.

John a Kent and John a Cumber, Pseudo-Chron. Munday, A. 1595. *Sh. Soc.* 1851.

John and Matilda, King, Chron. Davenport, R. 1624, 1655. Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s. iii.

*John of Gaunt, The Famous History of, with his Conquest of Spain.* S. R. 1594. Perhaps one with Hathway and Rankins' *Conquest of Spain*, 1601.

John the Evangelist, Enterlude of, fragment. Before 1557–65. Ed. W. W. Greg, Malone Society, 1907.

*Joseph's Afflictions.* Listed 1661. See Greg, ii, p. lxxix.

*Joshua.* Rowley, S. 1602. H. 171.

Jovial Crew, A, Com. Brome, R. 1641, 1652.

Jovial Philosopher, The. See Aristippus.

*Judas.* Haughton, Bird, Rowley, S. 1600. H. 122, 151.

*Judge, The*, Com. Massinger, P. Acted 1627. Warburton. One with The Fatal Dowry? Fleay, i, 223.

*Jugurtha*, Hist. Trag. Boyle, W. 1600. H. 118.

*Jugwith*, Hist. Trag. 1625–42. Mentioned, E. Gayton, *Festivous Notes on Don Quixote*, 1654, p. 271.

Julia Agrippina, Empress of Rome, Trag. May, T. 1628, 1639.

*Julian the Apostate*, Hist. Ashton, T.? Shrewsbury, 1566. See Chambers, ii, 394.

*Julian the Apostate*, Hist. 1596. H. 30.

*Julio and Hyppolita*, Trag. Qy. same as *Philippo and Hippolito*.

*Julius Cæsar*, Trag. Trinity, Oxford, n. d. See *Retros. Rev.* xii, 8.

Julius Cæsar, Senecan Trag. Alexander, W. Not acted. *The Monarchic Tragedies*, ed. 1607.

*Julius Cæsar*, Trag. Geddes, R. Oxford, 1582.

Julius Cæsar, Trag. May, T. *C.* 1625. MS.

Julius Cæsar, The Tragedy of. Shakespeare, W. 1601. Folio, 1623.

*Julius Cæsar*. At Court, Feb. 1562. Collier i, 180.

*Juno and Diana*, Com. 1565. *Cal. State Papers, Spanish*, 1558–1567, London, 1892, p. 404.

Jupiter and Io, Dialog. Heywood, T. *Pleasant Dialogues*, 1637.

Just General, The, T. C. Manuche, C. Before 1642? 1652.

Just Italian, The. Davenant, Sir W. Lic. 1629, 1630.

Katherine and Pasquil. See Jack Drum's Entertainment.

Kenilworth, The Princely Pleasures at, Entertainment. Gascoigne, G. 1575, 1576.

King and no King, A, T. C. Beaumont and Fletcher. Lic. 1611, 1619.

*King and Subject, The*, Trag. Massinger, P. Lic. June, 1638. See *The Tyrant*.

*King and the Poor Northern Man*. See *Too Good to be True*.

King John, Lud, etc. See John, Lud, etc.

*King of Fairies, The*. Mentioned in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, 1592.

*King of Scots, The Tragedy of the.* Hunnis, W.? 1567–68. Mentioned, *Harl. MS.* 146. See *Athenæum*, March 31, 1900.

Knack to Know a Knave, A, Com. 1592, 1594. Dodsley, vi.

Knack to Know an Honest Man, A, Com. 1595, 1596.

Knave in Grain, The, Com. Man. "By J. D." 1639, 1640.

*Knave in Print, or One for Another*, Com. Rowley, W. S. R. 1653.

Knight of Malta, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger, Field? 1619. Folio, 1647.

*Knight of Rhodes, The*, Hist. Peele, G. 1580-90. Mentioned in *Merry Conceited Jests of Peele*, 1627.

Knight of the Burning Pestle, The, Sat'l. Com. Beaumont (and Fletcher). 1607–08, 1613.

*Knight of the Burning Rock, The.* 1580. Revels, 142.

Knight of the Golden Shield. See Clyomon, Sir.

*Knights, Masque of.* 1579. Revels, 126.

Knights of the Helmet, A Masque of the. 1595. Gesta Grayorum, 1688. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii.

*Knot of Fools, A*, Com.? 1613. Halliwell, 139.

Kynes [sic] Redux, Lat.? Gager, W. Oxford, 1591. M. L. Lee, *Narcissus*, xiv.

Labyrinthus, Lat. Com. Hawkesworth, W. Cambridge, 1599. S. R. 1635. *Retros. Rev.* xii, 28, 35. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 308.

*Ladies, Masque of.* 1581. Revels, 177.

Ladies' Privilege, The, T. C. Glapthorne, H. 1635, 1640.

Lady Alimony, Sat'l. Com. *C.* 1635, 1659. Dodsley, xiv.

*Lady Barbara.* 1571. Revels, 13.

Lady Errant, The, T. C. Cartwright, W. 1635. *Comedies*, 1651.

1, *Lady Jane Grey*, Chron. Dekker, Heywood, Smith, Webster. 1602. H. 183. Perhaps an earlier version of Sir Thomas Wyatt, 1606.

2, *Lady Jane Grey.* Dekker, T. 1602. H. 184. See 1, *Lady Jane Grey.*

Lady Mother, The, T. C. Glapthorne, H. 1635. Perhaps one with The Noble Trial. S. R. 1660. Pr. Bullen, *Old Plays*, ii.

[Lady of May, The.] See Wanstead, Entertainment of her Majesty at.

Lady of Pleasure, A, Com. Shirley, J. 1635, 1637.

*Lady Peace, Masque of.* 1572. Revels, 19.

Lady's Trial, The, Com. Ford, J. 1638, 1639.

Lælia, Lat. Com. Cambridge, 1590. *MS. Lambeth*, 838. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 291.

*Lance Knights, Masque of Six.* 1574. Revels, 51.

Landgartha, Chron. Burnell, H. 1639, 1641. *Old English Drama*, 1824.

Larum for London, A, Hist. 1598–99, 1602. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, 1872.

Lascivious Queen, The. See Lust's Dominion.

Late Lancashire Witches, The, Drame de circonstance. Heywood, T. 1633, 1634.

*Late Murder of the Son upon the Mother*, Dom. Trag. Ford, Webster. S. R. 1624.

Launching of the May, The, or the Seaman's Honest Wife. "A eulogy of the East India Co." Methold, W. 1632. *Brit. Mus. MS. Egerton*, 1994. See *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxii, 137.

Law Tricks, or Who Would Have Thought It, Com. Man. Day, J. 1606, 1608.

Laws of Candy, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1619. Folio, 1647.

Leander, Lat. Com. Hawkesworth, W. 1598. *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane*, 1762, etc. *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 286.

Lear, King, Trag. Shakespeare, W. 1606, 1608.

Leir, King, Chron. Lodge, T.? and others. 1594, 1605. Hazlitt, *Shakespeare's Library*, vi.

Leo Armenus, Lat. Trag. Simeon, J. After 1631, 1657.

[Lethe, The Masque of.] See Lovers made Men.

*Lewis XI, King of France, The History of*, T. C. Advertised, 1658.

Light Heart, The. See The New Inn.

*Like Quits Like*, Com.? Heywood, Chettle. 1603. H. 173. A forgery. See Greg, *ibid.* xliii.

Like unto Like, Com. 1600. H. 131. Doubtless Grim the Collier.

Like Will to Like, Moral Intl. Fulwell, U. 1561, 1568. Dodsley, iii.

Lingua, Moral. Tomkins, J. 1603–04, 1607. Dodsley, ix.

Little French Lawyer, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1619. Folio, 1647.

Little Thief, The. See The Night Walker.

Locrine, Chron. Peele, G. 1586, 1595. Tyrrell, *Doubtful Plays of Shakespeare.*

Lodovick Sforza. See Sforza.

Loiola, Lat. Sat'l. Com. Hackett, J. Cambridge, 1622, 1648. *Retros. Rev.* xii.

Londini Artium et Scientium Scaturgio, Civic Pageant. Heywood, T. 1632.

Londini Emporia, Civic Pageant. Heywood, T. 1633.

Londini Sinus Salutis, Civic Pageant. Heywood, T. 1635.

Londini Speculum, Civic Pageant. Heywood, T. 1637.

Londini Status Pacatus, Civic Pageant. Heywood, T. 1639.

London, Entertainment through, March, 1603. Dekker, T. 1604.

*London, Royal Entertainment into*, 1603. S. R. 1604. Fleay, ii, 342.

London Chanticleers, The, Com. 1637, 1659. Dodsley, xii.

1, *London Florentine*, Com.? Chettle, Heywood. 1602. H. 172.

2, *London Florentine*, Com.? Chettle, H. 1602. H. 174.

*London Merchant, The*, Com. Ford, J. Before 1640. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

London Prodigal, The, Com. "William Shakespeare." 1603, 1605. Tyrrell, *Doubtful Plays of Shakespeare.*

London's Jus Honorarium, Civic Pageant. Heywood, T. 1631.

London's Love to Prince Henry, Entertainment. 1610.

London's Tempe, Civic Pageant. Dekker, T. 1629, n. d.

*Longbeard.* See *William Longbeard.*

*Long Meg of Westminster*, Com. 1594. H. 21. Mentioned in Amends for Ladies, II, i.

Longer Thou Livest, the More Fool Thou, The, Moral. Wager, W. 1559–60, n. d. [1568–80]. Repr. Brandl, *Jahrbuch*, xxxvi.

Longshank, Chron. 1595. H. 27. Perhaps Peele's Edward I.

*Longsword.* See *William Longsword.*

Look About You, Com. Wadeson, A. (Fleay, ii, 266.) 1594–99, 1600. Dodsley, vii.

*Look to the Lady*, Com.? Shirley, J. S. R. 1639. Halliwell, 149.

Looking Glass for London and England, A, Biblical Moral. Lodge, Greene. 1589, 1594.

Lords' Masque, The. Campion, T. 1613. Pr. with Cawsome-House, Entertainment at, 1613.

Lost Lady, The, T. C. Berkeley, Sir W. 1637? 1638. Dodsley, xii.

Lost Recovered, The. See The Captives.

Love, The Triumph of. See The Triumph of Love.

Love and Antiquity, The Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1619.

Love and Fortune. See Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune.

Love and Honor, Heroic T. C. Davenant, Sir W. 1634, 1649.

Love Crowns the End, Past. Tatham, J. 1632. *The Fancies' Theatre*, 1640.

Love Freed from Ignorance and Folly, Masque. Jonson, B. 1610. Folio, 1616.

*Love hath Found out his Eyes*, Com. Jordan, T. *C.* 1640. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

Love in a Maze. See The Changes.

Love in its Ecstasy, or the Large Prerogative, Past. Peaps, W.? 1635, 1649. Described, *Engl. Stud.* xxxv.

Love lies a Bleeding. See Philaster.

*Love of a Grecian Lady*, Com.? 1594. H. 19.

*Love of an English Lady*, Com.? 1594. H. 19.

*Love Parts Friendship*, Com.? Chettle, Smith. 1602. H. 165.

*Love Prevented*, Com.? Porter, H. 1598. H. 87.

Love Restored, Masque. Jonson, B. 1612. Folio, 1616.

Love Tricks, or the School of Compliment, Com. Man. Shirley, J. 1625, 1631.

Love will Find Out the Way. See The Constant Maid.

Lovers made Men, Masque. Jonson, B. 1617.

Lover's Melancholy, The, T. C. Ford, J. 1628, 1629.

*Lovers of Ludgate, The*, Com.? Before 1642. Warburton.

Lovers' Progress, The, Heroic T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1623. Folio, 1647.

*Love's Aftergame, or the Proxy*. 1635. Malone, iii, 238.

Love's Changelings Changed, Com. Before 1642? *Brit. Mus. MS. Egerton*, 1994. See Bullen, *Old Plays*, ii, 432.

Love's Cruelty, Trag. Shirley, J. 1631, 1640.

Love's Cure, Com. (Beaumont and Fletcher,) Massinger. 1626. Folio, 1647.

Love's Hospital, Com. Wilde, G. Oxford, 1636. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 14047.

Love's Labour's Lost, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1589, 1598.

*Love's Labour's Won*, Com. Shakespeare, W. Mentioned by Meres, 1598.

Love's Labyrinth or the Royal Shepherdess, T. C. Forde, T. Before 1642? 1660.

Love's Loadstone. See Pathomachia.

*Love's Masterpiece*, Com. Heywood, T. S. R. 1640.

Love's Metamorphosis, Court Drama. Lyly, J. 1588–89, 1601.

Love's Mistress, or the Queen's Masque, Court Drama. Heywood, T. 1634, 1636. Also called Cupid's Mistress, or Cupid and Psyche.

Love's Pilgrimage, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1635. Folio, 1647.

Love's Riddle, Past. Cowley, A. 1635, 1638. Grosart, *Cowley*, i.

Love's Sacrifice, Trag. Ford, J. 1630, 1633.

Love's Triumph through Callipolis, Masque. Jonson, B. 1631.

Love's Victory, Past. 1630. MS. in Plymouth Public Library. Extracts printed, 1853. Hazlitt, 143.

Love's Welcome at Bolsover, Entertainment. Jonson, B. 1634. Folio, 1640.

Lovesick Court, The, or the Ambitious Politic, T. C. Brome, R. 1627. *Five New Plays*, 1659.

Lovesick King, The, Chron. Brewer, A. 1604, 1655.

*Lovesick Maid, The, or The Honor of Young Ladies*, Com. Brome, R. Lic. 1629.

Loyal Subject, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1618. Folio, 1647.

*Loyalty and Beauty*. 1579. Revels, 142, 147.

*Lucia*. 1574. Revels, 87.

*Lud, King*, Chron. 1594. H. 16.

Ludlow Castle, "Masque" at. See Comus.

Luminalia, or the Festival of Light, Masque. Ascribed to Davenant, Sir W. 1638. Grosart, *Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies' Library*, iv. See Brotanek in *Anglia*, Beiblatt, xi, 177.

Lusiuncula, Lat. Before 1642? See Hazlitt, 145.

Lust's Dominion, Trag. "Christopher Marlowe." 1590, 1657. *Marlowe*, ed. Pickering, 1826, iii.

*Lusty London*, Intl. Puttenham, G. Before 1589. *Art of Poesie*, ed. Arber, 183.

Macbeth, The Tragedy of. Shakespeare, W. 1605–06. Folio, 1623.

[Macbeth] Lat. Speeches of Welcome, to King James at Oxford. Gwinne, M. 1605. Subjoined to Vertumnus, 1607. See *Variorum Macbeth*, p. 370.

*Macchiavel*, Com.? 1591. H. 13.

*Macchiavel and the Devil*, Com. Daborne, R. 1613. *Alleyn Papers*, 56.

Macchiavellus, Com. Wiburne, D. Cambridge, 1597. *Bodleian MS. Douce*, 234. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv.

*Mack, The*, Play of Cards. 1595. H. 22. See Malone, iii, 304.

Mad Couple Well Matched, The, Com. Brome, R. 1636. *Five New Plays*, 1653.

Mad Lover, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1619. Folio, 1647.

Mad World, my Masters, A, Com. Man. Middleton, T. 1606, 1608.

*Madcap, The*, Com.? Barnes, B.? Lic. 1624.

*Madman's Morris, The*, Com. Wilson, Drayton, Dekker. 1598. H. 89.

*Madoc, King of Britain, History of.* "Beaumont, F." Before 1642? S. R. June, 1660.

Mænander's Ecstasy. See Cynthia's Revenge.

Magnetic Lady, The, or Humors Reconciled, Com. Jonson, B. 1633. Folio, 1640 (bearing separate date 1631).

*Mahomet*, Conqueror Play? 1594. H. 18. Perhaps one with *Turkish Mahomet and Hiren* by Peele.

*Mahomet and Hiren.* See *Turkish Mahomet and Hiren the Fair Greek.*

Maid, a Widow, and a Wife, A Dialogue between a. Davies, Sir J. 1602.

Maid in the Mill, The, Rom. Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Rowley, W. Lic. 1623. Folio, 1647.

Maid of Honor, The, T. C. Massinger, P. 1622, 1632.

Maidenhead Well Lost, A, Com. Heywood, T. 1633, 1634.

*Maiden's Holiday, The*, Com.? "By Marlowe and Day." S. R. 1654. Warburton.

Maid's Metamorphosis, The, Court Com. Day, Lyly? 1599, 1600. Bullen, *Old Plays*, i.

Maid's Revenge, The, Trag. Shirley, J. 1626, 1639.

Maid's Tragedy, The. Beaumont and Fletcher. 1609–10, 1619.

*Malcolm King of Scots*, Chron. 1602. H. 165.

Malcontent, The, Com. Man. Marston, J. 1600, 1604.

Malfi, The Duchess of. See The Duchess of Malfi.

*Mamillia*. 1573. Revels, 51.

*Mandeville, Sir John*, Travel and Adventure. 1592. H. 13.

*Manhood and Desert*, Intl. Churchyard, T. Part of the Queen's Entertainment at Norwich, 1578. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii, 201.

*Manhood and Wisdom*. Listed, 1656. Greg, ii, p. lxxxvii.

*Man's Wit*, Moral Intl. Mentioned in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, 1592.

Marcus Geminus, Lat. Com. Oxford, 1566. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 210.

Mariam, the Fair Queen of Jewry, The Tragedy of. Carey, Lady E. 1612, 1613.

Marius and Sulla. See The Wounds of Civil War.

*Marriage Broker, The, or The Pander*. "By M. W." Before 1642? *Gratiæ Theatrales*, 1662.

Marriage of Mind and Measure, A Moral of the. 1578. Revels, 125.

Marriage of the Thames and the Rhine. See Inner Temple Masque. Beaumont.

Marriage of Wit and Science, The. Lic. 1569, n. d. Dodsley, ii.

Marriage of Wit and Wisdom, The Contract of a, Moral Intl. 1579. *Sh. Soc.* 1846.

*Marriage Without a Man, A*. See *Iphis and Ianthe*.

*Marshal Osric*, Pseudo-Hist. Heywood, Smith. 1597. H. 51.

*Martin Swart, his Life and Death*, Chron. 1597. H. 53. See Collier, ii, 334.

Martyred Soldier, The, Trag. Pseudo-Hist. Shirley, H. Before 1627, 1638. Bullen, *Old Plays*, i.

Mary Magdalene, Life and Repentance of. Biblical Intl. Wager, L. 1566.

*Masque*, Madrigal, for a. 1613. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 5336. fol. 24*b*. Music alone extant. Brotanek, 338.

Masquerade du Ciel. Sadler, J. Cambridge, 1639, 1640. See MS. note in Dyce's copy, South Kensington.

Massacre at Paris, The, Hist. Marlowe, C. 1593, n. d.

Massacre of France. See The Massacre at Paris.

Match at Midnight, A, Com. Middleton?, Rowley, W. Revised, 1623, 1633. Dodsley, xiii.

Match Me in London, Com. Man. Dekker, T. 1611–23, 1631.

*Maw, The Suit at*, Play of Cards. 1595. H. 21. See Malone, iii, 304. Fleay, i, 134, identifies with Match Me in London.

May-Day, Com. Man. Chapman, G. 1601, 1611.

Mayor of Quinborough, The. Middleton, T. 1596 or 1597, revived 1622, 1661.

Measure for Measure, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1603–04. Folio, 1623.

Medea, Tr. Seneca. *C.* 1600. *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane*, 911.

Medea, Tr. Studley, J. 1566. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

*Medicine for a Curst Wife, A*, Dom. Com.? Dekker, T. 1602. H. 169.

Melanthe Fabula Pastoralis, Lat. Brookes, S. Cambridge, 1615.

Meleager. Gager, W. Oxford, 1581, 1592. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 233.

Meleager, Publii Ovidii Nasonis, English Trag. MS. fragment. 1570–1590. Described by B. Dobell, *Athenæum*, Sept. 14, 1901.

Menæcmi, Com., Tr. Plautus. Warner, W. 1593, 1595. *Shakespeare's Library*, v.

*Merchant of Emden, The*, Dom. 1594. H. 18. See Evans, *Old Ballads*, i, 28.

Merchant of Venice, The, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1594, 1600.

Mercurius Britannicus, or the English Intelligencer, Sat'l. Com. Brathwaite, R. 1641.

Mercury Vindicated from the Alchemists, Masque. Jonson, B. 1615. Folio, 1616.

*Merry, Tragedy of Thomas*, Murder Play. Haughton, Day. 1599. H. 57.

*Merry as may be*, Com. Day, Hathway, Smith. 1602. H. 171.

Merry Beggars, The. See A Jovial Crew.

Merry Devil of Edmonton, The. Drayton, M., and others. 1600, 1608. Dodsley, x.

Merry Tricks. See Ram-Alley.

Merry Wives of Windsor, The, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1598, 1602.

Messalina, the Roman Empress, Trag. Richards, N. 1637, 1640. See Genest, x, 112.

Metamorphosed Gipsies, The Masque of the. See Gipsies, The Masque of.

Metropolis Coronata, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1615.

Michaelmas Term, Com. Man. Middleton, T. 1604, 1607.

*Microcosmus*, Lat. Trag. Arthur, T. Before 1600. MS. St. John's, Cambridge. Fleay, i, 27. Reported not found in *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 257.

Microcosmus, a Moral Masque. Nabbes, T. 1634, 1637. Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s. ii.

Midas, Court Com. Lyly, J. 1589, 1592.

Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn Masque, The. Chapman, G. 1613, n. d. [1613]. Nichols, *James*, ii, 588.

Middlesex Justice of Peace, The. See The Weeding of Covent Garden.

Midsummer-Night's Dream, A, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1595, 1600.

Milan, The Duke of, Trag. Massinger, P. 1620, 1623.

*Miller, The*. 1598. H. 84.

Minds, Interlude of, Moral., Tr. from the Dutch. Nicholas, H. See *Restituta*, iv, 142.

*Minerva's Sacrifice*, Trag. Massinger, P. Lic. 1629. S. R. Sept. 1653. Warburton. One with The Queen of Corinth? Fleay, i, 224.

*Mingo* or *Mings*. 1577. Collier, *Northbrooke's Treatise*, viii; *Notes and Queries*, IX, ii, 444.

Mirza, Trag. Baron, R. Before 1642? *c.* 1648.

Miseries of Enforced Marriage, The, Dom. Drama. Wilkins, G. 1605, 1607. Dodsley, ix.

[Misfortunes of Arthur, The], otherwise Certain Devices, etc. Hughes, T., and others. 1587, n. d. [1587]. Ed. H. C. Grumbine, 1900.

Misogonus, Com. Johnson, L.? 1560–77. Pr. by Brandl, *Quellen und Forschungen*, lxxx, 1898.

[*Mock Play, A.*] Cambridge, 1564. *Spanish State Papers*, i, 375. See Ward, ii, 628.

Monsieur D'Olive, Com. Chapman, G. 1605, 1606.

Monsieur Thomas, Com. Man. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. After 1610, 1639.

Montacute, Viscount, Masque for. Gascoigne, G. 1571. *A Hundreth Sundry Flowers*, 1572.

Monuments of Honor, Civic Pageant. Webster, J. 1624.

Moor of Venice. 1605. Revels, 203. See Othello.

*Moors, Masque of.* 1605. Revels, 204.

*Moore's Masque.* Oxford, 1636. Fleay, ii, 358.

More, Sir Thomas, Chron. 1590. Dyce, *Sh. Soc.* 1844.

More Dissemblers besides Women. Middleton, T. Revised, 1622. *Two New Plays*, 1657.

Mors Comœdia, Lat. Drury, W. 1620. *Dramatica Poemata*, 1628.

Mortimer his Fall, Chron. fragment. Jonson, B. 1602. Folio, 1640. H. 170. Gifford, *Jonson*, vi.

*Most Vertuous and Godly Susanna, The.* Garter, T. Lic. 1569, 1578. See *Biog. Dram.* iii, 310.

Mother Bombie, Com. Lyly, J. 1590, 1594.

*Mother Redcap*, Com. Drayton, Munday. 1597. H. 70. Cf. The Wise Woman of Hogsdon, II, i,

Mountebanks, The Masque of Gray's Inn with the Antimasques of. Fragment. Marston, J.? 1618. Collier, *Five Court Masques, Sh. Soc.* 1848.

Mucedorus, Rom. Com. Lodge, T.? 1588–98, 1598. Dodsley, vii.

Much Ado About Nothing, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1598, 1600.

*Mucius Scævola.* 1577. Revels, 102.

Mulleasses, the Turk, Trag. Mason, J. 1607, 1610.

*Mulmutius Dunwallow*, Chron. Rankins, W. 1598. H. 96.

Mulomorco, or Mulamulloco. 1591. H. 13. One with Peele's Battle of Alcazar. Malone, iii, 297.

*Mundus Plumbeus*, Lat. Com. Arthur, T. MS. St. Johns, Cambridge. Fleay, i, 27. Reported not found, *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 257.

*Murderous Michael, The History of.* 1579. Revels, 143. Perhaps one with Arden of Feversham. See Collier, iii, 26.

Muses' Looking Glass, The, Sat'l. Com. Randolph, T. 1634. *Poems*, 1638.

Mustapha, Trag. Greville, F. 1606, 1609.

*Nann's Masque.* Before 1642. Music in Elizabeth Rogers her Virginal Book, *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10337. Brotanek.

[Narcissus], a Twelfth Night Merriment, Farce. Oxford, 1602. Ed. M. L. Lee, 1893.

*Narcissus, The Play of.* Acted, 1572. Revels, 11, 13.

Naufragium Joculare, Com. Cowley, A. 1638. Grosart's *Cowley*, i.

*Nebuchadnezzar.* 1596. H. 50.

Necromantes, or the Two Supposed Heads, Com. Percy, W. 1601–02. *Percy MS.* Duke of Devonshire's Library.

*Nectar et Ambrosia*, Lat. Trag. Campion, E. Oxford, 1564. See *Athen. Oxon.* i, 475.

Neptune's Triumph for the Return of Albion, Masque. Jonson, B. 1624, n. d.

Nero, Claudius Tiberius, Trag. 1606, 1607.

Nero, The Tragedy of. 1623, 1624, Bullen, *Old Plays*, i.

Nero, tragœdia nova, Lat. Gwinne, M. 1603. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 267.

*Netherlands, Play of the.* Listed, 1656. Greg, ii, p. xci.

New Academy, The, or the New Exchange, Com. Man. Brome, R. 1628? *Five New Plays*, 1659.

New Custom, Polemical Moral. Revived 1563, 1573. Dodsley, iii.

*New Guise.* 1575 Mentioned by Laneham. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 454.

New Inn, The, or the Light Heart, Com. Jonson, B. 1629, 1631.

New Ordinary, The. See The Damoiselle.

New River, Entertainment at the Opening of. Middleton, T. 1613.

New Trick to Cheat the Devil, A, Com. Man. Davenport, R. 1625–36, 1639. Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s. iii.

New Way to Pay Old Debts, A, Com. Massinger, P. 1625, 1633.

New Way to Please You, A. See The Old Law.

New Wonder, A, a Woman Never Vexed. Rowlêy, W. 1631, 1632. Dodsley, xii.

*New World's Tragedy.* 1595. H. 27.

News from Plymouth, Com. Man. Davenant, Sir W. 1635. Folio, 1673.

News from the New World Discovered in the Moon, Masque. Jonson, B. 1621. Folio, 1640.

News out of the West, Intl. Pr. 1647. Halliwell, 180.

Nice Valor, The, or the Passionate Madman, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Middleton? Revised *c.* 1614. Folio, 1647.

Nice Wanton, A Pretty Interlude called, "T. R." 1547–53, 1560. Manly, i.

Night Walker, The, or the Little Thief, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1614. Revised by Shirley? 1633, 1640.

*Nineveh's Repentance.* Listed, 1656. Greg, ii, p. xcii.

*Ninus and Semiramis.* S. R. May, 1595. Mentioned in Heywood's *Apology for Actors*, 1612.

No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's, Com. Man. Middleton, T. 1613, 1657.

*Noble Choice, The*, T. C. Massinger, P. Before 1640. Warburton. See *The Orator*.

Noble Gentleman, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. Rowley, W. Lic. 1625. Folio, 1647.

*Noble Grandchild, The*. 1614. Warner's *Cat. of Dulwich*.

*Noble Ravishers, The*. S. R. 1653. Halliwell, 182.

Noble [Spanish] Soldier, The, or a Contract Broken Justly Revenged, Pseudo-Hist. Rowley, S., Dekker. 1631, 1634. Bullen, *Old Plays*, i.

Noble Stranger, The, T. C. Sharpe, Lewis. 1638, 1640. See Genest, x, 117.

*Noble Trial, The*, Trag. Glapthorne, H. *C.* 1639. Warburton. Surmised the same with The Lady Mother, by Fleay, i, 244.

*Nobleman, The*, T. C. Tourneur, C. S. R. Feb. 1612. Warburton. Revels, 211.

Nobody and Somebody, Chron. 1592, n. d. [1606]. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, ii.

*Nonesuch, The*, Com. "Rowley, W." S. R. 1660. Warburton.

Nonpareils, The. See Love and Honor.

Northern Lass, The, Com. Brome, R. 1630, 1632.

Northward Hoe, Com. Man. Dekker, Webster. 1605, 1607.

Norwich, Princely Masque at. Goldingham, W. 1578. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii, 159.

Norwich, Receiving of the Queen into, Entertainment. Garter, B., Goldingham, H. 1578, n. d. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii, 136.

Norwich Pageants, Miracle Plays. 1565. Manly, i.

*Nothing Impossible to Love*, Trag.? Le Grys, R. *C.* 1630. (Fleay, ii, 36.) S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

*Nottingham Castle, Devises for*, Moral Masque. 1562. See Evans, *The English Masque*, xxiii.

Nottola, Lat. Com. Before 1642? *Douce MS.* no. 47. Hazlitt, 168.

Novella, The, Com. Man. Brome, R. 1632. *Five New Plays*, 1653.

Oberon, the Faery Prince, Masque. Jonson, B. 1611. Folio, 1616.

Obstinate Lady, The, Com. Cockayne, Sir A. 1638–39, 1657.

Octavia, Tr. Nuce, or Newton, T. 1561. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

Octavia, The Virtuous, T. C. Senecan. Brandon, S. 1598.

Œdipus, Lat. Tr. Gager, W. Oxford, 1580. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 22583. Fragment. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 236.

Œdipus, Tr. Nevile, A. 1560. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

Old Couple, The, Com. May, T. 1619, 1658. Dodsley, xii.

Old Drapery, Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1614.

Old Fortunatus, Com. Dekker, T. 1596, 1600.

Old Law, The, Com. Massinger, Rowley, W. 1599–1607, 1656.

Old Man's Lesson and a Young Man's Love, An, Dialog. Breton, N. 1605.

*Old Tobit*, Bible Play. Lincoln, 1564. *Gentleman's Magazine*, liv, 103.

Old Wives' Tale, The, Com. Peele, G. 1590, 1595.

1, Oldcastle, The First Part of Sir John, Chron. Drayton, Hathway, Munday, Wilson. 1598, 1600. Tyrrell, *Doubtful Plays of Shakespeare.*

2, *Oldcastle*, Chron. Drayton, Hathway, Munday, Wilson. 1599. H. 113.

*Olympio and Ingenio.* 1595. H. 24.

Opportunity, The, Com. Shirley, J. Lic. 1634, 1640.

*Orator, The*, T. C.? Massinger, P. Lic. Jan. 1635. One with *The Noble Choice* and The Elder Brother? Fleay, i, 228.

Ordinary, Shank's. Shank, J. Lic. 1624. Malone, *Variorum Shakspeare*, iii, 221.

Ordinary, The, Com. Man. Cartwright, W. 1634. *Comedies*, 1651. Dodsley, xii.
Orestes, Trag. or Moral. 1567. Mentioned, *Harl. MS.* 146. One with Pickering's Horestes.
Orestes, The Tragedy of. Goffe, T. 1623, 1633.
*Orestes Furies*. Dekker, T. 1599. H. 107.
Orestes. See Horestes.
Orgula or the Fatal Error, Trag. "By L. W." Before 1642? 1658.
Orlando Furioso, Rom. Com. Greene, R. 1592, 1594.
*Orphan's Tragedy*. Day, Haughton, Chettle. 1599. H. 57.
*Orpheus*, Com. Before 1642? Warburton. "Fragment in Brit. Mus.," Fleay, ii, 336.
Osmond, the Great Turk or the Noble Servant, T. C. Carlell, L. 1638. *Two New Plays*, 1657.
*Osric*. See *Marshal Osric*.
Othello, the Moor of Venice, The Tragedy of. Shakespeare, W. 1604, 1622.
*Overthrow of Rebels, The*, Hist. 1602. H. 184.
*Owen Tudor*. Drayton, Munday, Hathway, Wilson. 1600. H. 117.
*Owl, The*. "A play." Daborne, R. 1613. See *Alleyn Papers*, 72. Greg, ii, p. xcv.
Owls, The Masque of. Jonson, B. 1626. Folio, 1640.

*Page of Plymouth*, Murder Play. Jonson, Dekker. 1599. H. 110. See *Sh. Soc. Papers*, ii, 79.
*Painful Pilgrimage, The*, Moral. 1567–68. Mentioned, *Harl. MS.* 146. Collier, i, 194.
*Painter's Daughter, The*. 1576. Revels, 101.
*Palæmon and Arcite*, Trag. 1594. H. 19.
*Palæmon and Arcite*, Trag. Edwards, R. 1566. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 212.
Palantus and Eudora. See The Conspiracy.
*Panacæa*. 1574. Revels, 87.
Pan's Anniversary, Masque. Jonson, B. 1620. Folio, 1640.
*Paradox, The*, Com.? 1596. H. 42.

Parasitaster, or the Fawn, Com. Man. Marston, J. 1604, 1606.

*Paria*, Lat. Com. Vincent, T. Cambridge, 1627, 1648. Listed, 1656.

*Paris and Vienna*, Heroical Rom. 1572. Revels, 13.

Parliament of Bees, The, Allegorical Dialog. Day, J. Not acted, 1641.

Parliament of Love, The, Com. Man. fragment. Massinger, Rowley, W.? Lic. 1624.

Parricide, The, Trag. Glapthorne, H. Lic. 1624. S. R. Nov. 1653. Perhaps one with Revenge for Honor.

Parson's Wedding, The, Com. Man. Killigrew, T. 1635, *Comedies and Tragedies*, 1641. Dodsley, xiv.

Parthenia, Past., Tr. Groto. Before 1603. Cambridge. *MS.* Emmanuel College, i, 3, 16. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 319.

Partial Law, The, T. C. 1620–30. To be printed from the original MS. See B. Dobell, *Cat.* 146, Dec. 1906.

Pasquil and Catherine, The Comedy of. See Jack Drum's Entertainment.

*Passion of Christ, The.* Ashton, T. ? 1561. See Phillips, *History of Shrewsbury*, 201.

1, 2, Passionate Lovers, The, T. C. Carlell, L. 1636, 1655.

Pastor Fido, Il, Tr. Guarini. Dymocke, J.? 1602. See Greg, *Pastoral*, 242 n.

Pastor Fido, Il, Tr. Guarini. Fanshaw, R. 1633, 1647. See Greg, *Pastoral*, 242.

Pastor Fido, Il, or The Faithful Sheapheard, Tr. Guarini. Sidnam, J. 1630. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 29493.

Pastor Fido, Il, . . . recitata in Collegio Regali Cantabrigiæ, Tr. Guarini. 1606. *Cambridge University Library MS.* Ff. ii, 9.

Pastor Fidus. See Pastor Fido . . . recitata, etc.

*Pastoral Tragedy.* Chapman, G. 1599. H. 110.

Pathomachia, or the Battle of the Affections, Moral. 1630.

Patient Grissil, Com. Dekker, Chettle, Haughton. 1598, 1603. Ed. G. Hübsch, 1893.

Peace, The Triumph of, Masque. Shirley, J. 1634, 1633[4].
"*Peace and Discord*," Masque. Fleay, ii, 341.
*Peaceable King, The, or Lord Mendall.* Lic. An Old Play, 1623.
Pedantius, Lat. Com. Wingfield, M., or Forsett, E. Cambridge, 1581, 1631. Ed. G. C. M. Smith, *Materialien zur Kunde*, 1905.
*Pedlars' Masque, The.* 1574. Revels, 87.
Pedlar's Prophecy, The, Moral Intl. Wilson, R. 1590, 1595.
Pelopidarum Secunda, Lat. Trag. Before 1603. *Harl. MS.* 5110.
Pelopœa and Alope. See Amphrissa.
Penates. Jonson, B. See Highgate.
Perfidius Hetruscus, Lat. Trag. Date and college unknown. *Bodleian MS. Rawl. C.* 787. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 250.
Pericles, Prince of Tyre, "Romance." Shakespeare, W. 1608, 1609.
Perkin Warbeck, Chron. Ford, J. 1633, 1634.
*Perseus and Andromeda* [*Anthomiris*]. 1574. Revels, 68.
Petronius Maximus, Trag. "W. S." 1619. Constable's *Edinburgh Magazine*, 1821. Qy. Valentinian.
*Phædrastus and Phigon.* 1574. Revels, 87.
Phaeton, Court Drama. Dekker, T. 1598. H. 83. Identified by Gifford, *Ford*, ii, 360, with The Sun's Darling.
Pharamus sive Libido Vindex. See Thibaldus.
*Pharaoh's Daughter.* Mentioned by K. L. Bates, *The English Religious Drama*, 251.
Philaster, or Love Lies a Bleeding, T. C. Beaumont and Fletcher. 1609, 1620.
*Philemon and Felicia.* 1574. Revels, 68.
*Philenzo and Hippolyta*, "T. C. Massinger, P." Warburton. See *Philippo and Hippolito.*
*Philip of Spain*, Hist. 1602. H. 169.
*Philippo and Hippolito.* 1594. H. 18.
Philoctetes, Tr. Sophocles. Lat. Ascham, R. Before 1568.
*Philomanthes*, Lat. Trag. of the Christmas Prince, 1607.
*Philomela*, Lat. Trag. of the Christmas Prince, 1607.

Philosophaster, Lat. Com. Burton, R. Oxford, 1618. Pr. privately, Roxburghe Club, 1862.

*Philotas*, a play on. Lateware, R. 1588. Mentioned by Daniel in his "Apology" and appended to his *Philotas*.

Philotas, The Tragedy of. Daniel, S. 1600–04, 1607.

Philotus, Com. *C.* 1600, 1603. Repr. Bannatyne Club, 1835.

*Phocas*, or *Focasse*. Slater, M. 1596. H. 30.

Phœbus' Knights. See Whitehall, Masque at, in Honor of the Marriage of Lord Hayes.

Phœnix, The, Com. Man. Middleton, T. 1607.

Phœnix in her Flames, The, Dramatized Rom. Lower, Sir W. 1638, 1639. See Genest, x, 69.

Phormio, Tr. Bernard, R. Terence in English, 1598.

*Phyllida and Corin*. 1584. Revels, 188.

Picture, The, T. C. Massinger, P. Lic. 1629, 1630.

*Pierce, Alice*. See *Alice Pierce*.

*Pierce of Exton*, Chron. Wilson, Dekker, Drayton, Chettle. 1598. H. 85.

*Pierce of Winchester*. Dekker, Drayton, Wilson. 1598. H. 91.

Pilgrim, The, Rom. Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1621. Folio, 1647.

Pilgrimage to Parnassus, The, Sat'l. Com. Cambridge, 1598. Ed. W. D. Macray, 1886.

Pinner of Wakefield, The. See George a Greene.

*Pirate, The*. Davenport, R. Fleay, ii, 369.

*Pity the Maid*. S. R. 1653.

*Placidas, Sir*. Chettle, H. 1599. H. 106.

*Plantation of Virginia, A Tragedy of the*. Lic. 1623. Collier, i, 445.

Platonic Lovers, The, T. C. Davenant, Sir W. 1635, 1636.

"*Play of Pastoral*." Mentioned in Sir Humphrey Mildmay's Diary, 1634.

*Play of Plays, The*. Mentioned as acted 1580, in Gosson's *Plays Confuted*. See Fleay, i, 249. See *Delight*.

"Play of Strange Morality, A." Mentioned by Nash, *Choos-*

*ing of Valentines*, 1590–1600. See Grosart, *Nash*, i, p. lx.

Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue, Masque. Jonson, B. 1618. Folio, 1640.

Plutophthalmia Plutogamia, or Hey for Honesty, Down with Knavery. Randolph, T.? Before 1635, 1651.

Poetaster, or his Arraignment, Sat'l. Com. Jonson, B. 1601, 1602.

*Politic Bankrupt, The, or Which is the Best Girl.* S. R. 1653.

Politic Father, The. One with The Brothers. Lic. 1641. See Fleay, ii, 246.

*Politic Queen, The, or Murder will Out*, Trag. Davenport, R. 1625–36. S. R. June, 1660.

Politician, The, Trag. Shirley, J. 1639, 1655.

Polyeuctes, or the Martyr, Tr. Corneille. Lower, Sir W. 1641, 1655.

Polyhymnia, a Triumph at Tilt. Peele, G. 1589, 1590.

*Polyphemus.* Chettle, H. 1599. H. 102.

*Pompey, A Story of.* 1580. Revels, 167. Cf. *Cæsar and Pompey.*

Pompey the Great, his Fair Cornelia's Tragedy. Later title for Kyd's Cornelia.

*Pontius Pilate.* Prologue and epilogue by Dekker. 1602. H. 153.

Poor Man's Comfort, The, Past. Com. Daborne, R. 1613, 1655.

*Poor Man's Paradise.* Haughton, W. 1599. H. 110.

*Poor Northern Man, The.* See *Too Good to be True.*

*Pope Joan*, Pseudo-Hist. 1592. H. 13.

Porta Pietatis, Civic Pageant. Heywood, T. 1638.

*Portio and Demorantes.* 1580. Revels, 155.

*Praise at Parting*, Moral. Gosson, S. 1579. See Fleay, i, 248.

*Predor and Lucia.* 1573. Revels, 51.

Presentation for the Prince, A. See Charles, Prince.

*Pretestus.* 1575. Revels, 87.

Prince d'Armour, The Triumphs of the, Masque. Davenant, Sir W. 1635.

Prince of Tarent. See A Very Woman.

Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth. See Kenilworth.

Princess, The, or Love at First Sight, T. C. Killigrew, T. 1637–38. *Comedies and Tragedies*, 1664.

*Prisoner, The.* One with *The Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo.*

Prisoners, The, T. C. Killigrew, T. 1637. With Claracilla, 1641.

Privy Council, Entertainments for the Lords of the. Middleton, T. 1621.

*Prodigal Scholar, The*, Com. Randolph, T. S. R. 1660.

*Prodigality*, Moral. 1568. Mentioned, *Harl. MS.* 146. See Collier, i, 194.

*Progne*, Lat. Trag. Calfhill, J. Oxford, 1566. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 215.

*Projector Lately Dead, A*, Com. 1636. See Halliwell, 201.

Promos and Cassandra, The History of, Com. Whetstone, G. Not acted, 1578. Hazlitt, *Shakespeare's Library*, iii.

Prophetess, The, or the History of Diocletian, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. Lic. 1622. Folio, 1647.

Proteus and the Rock Adamantine, The Masque of. Davison, F., Campion, T. 1595. *Gesta Grayorum*, 1688. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii.

*Proud Maid, The*, Trag. 1613. Revels, 211.

Pseudomagia, Lat. Com. Mewe, W. 1618–26. Cambridge. MS. Emmanuel Coll. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 317.

*Ptolemy.* Mentioned, Gosson, *School of Abuse*, 1579.

Puritan, The, or the Widow of Watling Street, Com. Man. Middleton, T.? 1606, 1607. Tyrrell, *Doubtful Plays of Shakespeare.*

*Puritan Maid, the Modest Wife, and the Wanton Widow, The*, Com. Middleton, T. Before 1627. S. R. Sept. 1653. Warburton.

*Pythagoras.* Slater, M. 1596. H. 27.

*Queen, The*, Trag. "John Fletcher." Listed, 1656. Greg, ii, p. c.

Queen, The, or the Excellency of her Sex, T. C. Published by Gough, A. Before 1642, 1653. Ascribed to Ford by W. Bang. See his ed. *Materialien zur Kunde*, xiii.

Queen and Concubine, The, T. C. Brome, R. 1635, 1659.

Queen Elizabeth's Entertainment at Elvethan. Breton, N., and others. 1591. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 102.

Queen Hester. See Hester.

Queen of Aragon, The, T. C. Habington, W. 1640. Dodsley, xiii.

Queen of Corinth, The, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger, Field. 1618. Folio, 1647.

*Queen of Corsica, The*, Trag. Jaques, F. 1642. *Brit. Mus. MS. Lansdowne*, 807.

*Queen of Ethiopia, The*, Rom. Bristol, 1578. *Northbrooke's Treatise*, p. viii.

Queens, The Masque of. Jonson, B. 1609.

Queen's Arcadia, The, Past. Daniel, S. 1605, 1606.

Queens' Exchange, The, T. C. Brome, R. 1632, 1657.

Queen's Masque, The. See Love's Mistress.

*Queen's Masque, The.* Date unknown. Music in Playford's *Musick's Handmaid*, 1678. Brotanek.

Queen's Wake, The. See Tethy's Festival.

*Quid pro Quo.* 1578. *Notes and Queries*, ix, ii, 444.

Quintus Fabius. 1574. Revels, 51.

Raging Turk, The, or Bajazet II. Goffe, T. Before 1627, 1631.

Ram-Alley, or Merry Tricks, Com. Barrey, L. 1609, 1611. Dodsley, x.

*Randall, Earl of Chester*, Chron. Middleton, T. 1602. H. 171.

*Ranger's Comedy, The.* 1594. H. 17.

Rape of Lucrece, The, Trag. Heywood, T. 1603, 1608.

*Rape of the Second Helen, The History of the.* 1579. Revels, 125.

Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune, The, Mythological Court Play. 1582, 1589. Revels, 176. Dodsley, vi.

*Raymond, Duke of Lyons*, Hist. 1613. *Biog. Dram.* iii, 193.

*Re Vera or Verily*, Lat. Sat'l. Com. Ruggle, G. 1598. Fleay, ii, 172.

Rebellion, The, Trag. Rawlins, T. 1639, 1640. Dodsley, xiv.

*Red Knight, The*, Rom. Bristol, 1576. *Northbrooke's Treatise*, note, p. x.

*Regicidium*, Lat. Hist.? Before 1642. Mentioned, *Retros. Rev.* xii, 8.

Renegado, The, T. C. Massinger, P. 1624, 1630.

Reparatus sive Depositum, Tragico-comœdia. Drury, W. 1620. *Dramatica Poemata*, 1628.

Repentance of Mary Magdalene, The, Intl. Wager, L. 1565, 1567. Ed. F. I. Carpenter, 1902.

1, Return from Parnassus, The, Sat'l. College Play. 1601. First pr. ed. W. D. Macray, 1886.

2, Return from Parnassus, The, or The Scourge of Simony, Sat'l. College Play. 1602, 1606. Repr. ed. W. D. Macray, 1886.

Re-united Britannia, The Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1605, n. d.

Revenge for a Father, A. See Hoffman.

Revenge for Honor, Trag. "By Chapman, G."?, Glapthorne, H. 1624, 1654. *Chapman*, 1874, iii.

Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois, The, Trag. Chapman, G. 1604, 1613.

Revenger's Tragedy, The, or the Loyal Brother. Tourneur, C. 1606–07, 1607. Dodsley, x.

Rhodon and Iris, Past. Knevet, R. 1631. See H. Smith, *Pastoral Influence*, 74.

Ricardus Tertius. 1586. Lacy, H. A transcript of Legge's Tragedy.

*Richard Cordelion's Funeral.* Wilson, Chettle, Munday, Drayton. 1598. H. 87.

Richard, Duke of York, The True Tragedy of. See 2, Contention.

Richard, Duke of York, The True Tragedy of. Second part of The Whole Contention between the Two Famous Houses, Lancaster and York, Chron. 1590, 1595.

*Richard, the Confessor*, [sic], Chron.? 1593. H. 16. See Fleay, ii, 298.

[Richard II, A Tragedy of King,] Chron. 1591. Pr. Halliwell-Phillipps, 1870. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxv.

*Richard II, The Deposing of*, Trag. Mentioned in Camden's *Annales Rerum*, ed. 1625, p. 810. Perhaps Shakespeare's.

Richard II, The Tragedy of. Shakespeare, W. 1594, 1597.

*Richard II*, Trag. 1611. Reported by Dr. Forman. See Ward, i, 387.

*Richard Crookback*. Jonson, B. 1602. H. 168. *Alleyn Papers*, 24.

*Richard III, A Tragedy of, or the English Prophet*. Rowley, S. Lic. 1623.

Richard III, The Tragedy of King. Shakespeare, W. 1593, 1597.

Richard III, The True Tragedy of, Chron. Peele, Lodge, Kyd? 1591, 1595. Ed. B. Field, *Sh. Soc.* 1844.

Richardus Tertius, Lat. Trag. Legge, T. 1579. *Sh. Soc.* 1844.

Richmond, The King and Queen's Entertainment at. 1636. Repr. Bang and Brotanek, *Materialien zur Kunde*, ii, 1903.

Ring, The. Before 1633. Mentioned in Shirley's Bird in a Cage, II, i. Qy. Two Merry Milkmaids.

*Rising of Cardinal Wolsey, The*, Chron. Chettle, Munday, Drayton, Smith. 1601. H. 149.

Rival Friends, The. Hausted, P. 1631, 1632. See Genest, x, 148.

Rivales, Lat. Com. Gager, W. Oxford, 1583.

Roaring Girl, The, or Moll Cutpurse. Middleton, T. 1610, 1611.

*Robert II, King of Scots*, Trag. Dekker, Jonson, Chettle. 1599. H. 111.

Robert, Earl of Huntington, The Death of, Chron. Munday, Chettle. 1598, 1601. Dodsley, viii.

Robert, Earl of Huntington, The Downfall of, Chron. Munday, A. 1598, 1601. Dodsley, viii.

Robin Conscience, Dialog. 1575, 1579. See Collier, ii, 403; Fleay, ii, 294.

*Robin Goodfellow*. Chettle, H. 1602. H. 181. This title is an interpolation of Collier's. See Greg, *ibid*. xliv.

Robin Hood, A Tale of. See The Sad Shepherd.

*Robin Hood and Little John, A Pastoral Comedy of*. S. R. 1594. Listed, 1656. Greg, ii, p. ciii.

1, Robin Hood. See Robert, Earl of Huntington, Downfall of.

2, Robin Hood. See Robert, Earl of Huntington, Death of.

*Robin Hood's Pennyworths*. Haughton, W. 1600. H. 124.

*Roderick*, Trag.? Chettle, H.? 1600. H. 131. Fleay, ii, 308.

Roister Doister, Com. Udall, N. 1534–41, n. d. [1566–67]. Dodsley, iii.

Rollo, Duke of Normandy. See The Bloody Brother.

Roman Actor, The, Trag. Massinger, P. 1626, 1629.

Romanus, Trag. "Ja. Co." Before 1642. "Design" alone extant, *Brit. Mus. MS. Harl.* 4628.

*Romeo and Juliet*, Trag. 1562. Mentioned by Brooke in his *Tragical History*. See Ward, i, 116, 394.

Romeo and Juliet, Trag. Shakespeare, W. 1591–96, 1597.

Romeus et Julietta, Lat. fragment. 1615? *Brit. Mus. MS. Sloane*, 1775. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 255.

Rosania or Love's Victory. One with The Doubtful Heir. Fleay, ii, 245.

Roxana, Lat. Trag., Tr. Groto. Alabaster, W. Before 1592. Cambridge. See *Retros. Rev.* xii, 19.

Royal Choice, The, T. C. Stapyleton, R. Before 1642? 1653.

*Royal Combat, The*, Com. Ford, J. Before 1640. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.

Royal King and the Loyal Subject, The, T. C. Heywood, T. 1618, 1637. Ed. K. W. Tibbals, 1906.

Royal Master, The, Com. Shirley, J. 1638.

Royal Slave, The, T. C. Cartwright, W. 1636, 1639.

*Royal Widow of England, The History of a.* 1602. Mentioned in *The Diary of the Duke of Stettin*, Trans. Royal Hist. Soc. vi, 1892.

Rule a Wife and have a Wife, Com. Intrigue. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. Lic. 1624, 1640.

*"Running" or Travelling Masque, The.* 1620. See Nichols, *James*, iii, 587.

Sad One, The, Trag. fragment. Suckling, Sir J. 1640. *Last Remains of Suckling*, 1659.

Sad Shepherd, The, Past. fragment. Jonson, B. 1614. Folio, 1640.

*Sages, Masque of Six.* 1574. Revels, 51.

*Sailors' Masque, The.* 1620. Halliwell, 218.

*St. Albans, The Tragedy of.* Shirley, J. S. R. 1639.

*St. George for England*, Chron.? Smith, William. 1615–23. See Fleay, ii, 251, who refers it to Warburton's List. I do not find it there.

St. Patrick for Ireland, Rom. Miracle Play. Shirley, J. 1639, 1640.

*Salisbury Plain.* After 1625. Halliwell, 219. Qy. one with Wilde's The Converted Robber.

Salmacida Spolia, Masque. Davenant, Sir W. 1640.

*Sampson.* Rowley, S., Juby, E. 1602. H. 169. Mentioned in The Family of Love, I, iii; and in *The Diary of the Duke of Stettin*, 1602.

Sapho and Phao, Court Com. Lyly, J. 1581, 1584.

Sapientia Salomonis, Tr. Birck, Lat. Biblical Senecan Play. Oxford, 1566. *Brit. Mus. MS.* 20061. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 224, 323.

*Sarpedon.* 1580. Revels, 155.

Satire of the Three Estates, A, Moral. Lindsay, Sir D. 1540, 1602.

Satiromastix. Dekker, T. 1602.

[Satyr, The.] See Althorpe, Entertainment at.

*Scanderbeg, The True History of George*, Conqueror Play. Marlowe, C. Before 1593. S. R. 1601.

*Scholar, The*, Com. Lovelace, R. 1636? Prologue and Epilogue in *Lucasta*, 1649.

School of Compliment, The. See Love Tricks.

*Scipio Africanus*. 1581. Revels, 155.

Scornful Lady, The, Com. Man. Beaumont and Fletcher. 1609, 1616.

Scyros, Fabula Pastoralis, Tr. Bonarelli. Brooke, S. 1612. *Cambridge University Library, MS.* Ee. 5, 16, and others.

Sea Feast. See Aphrodisial.

Sea Voyage, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. Lic. 1622. Folio, 1647.

*Sebastian, King of Portugal*. Dekker, Chettle. 1601. H. 136. Perhaps Stukeley or an earlier version of Believe as You List.

[Second Maiden's Tragedy, The.] Lic. 1611. Pr. Baldwin's *Old English Drama*, 1824–25. Dodsley, x.

See Me and See Me Not. See Hans Beer-Pot.

Sejanus his Fall, Trag. Jonson, B. 1603, 1605.

Selimus, The First Part of the Tragical Reign of, Conqueror Play. Greene, R.? 1588, 1594.

Senile Odium, Lat. Com. Hausted, P. Cambridge, 1630, 1633. *Retros. Rev.* xii.

Senilis Amor, Lat. Com. Cambridge, 1635. *MS. Rawl. Poet.* 9.

[Serule and Astrea], eine Comoedia von eines Königes Sohn aufs Engeland und des Königes Tochter aufs Schottlandt. Pseudo-Hist. Before 1620. See Cohn, *Shakespeare in Germany*, cviii, cx.

*Set at Tennis*. Munday, A. 1602. H. 172.

Seven Champions of Christendom, The, Heroical Rom. Kirke, J. 1634, 1638. See Genest, x, 108.

1, 2, *Seven Days of the Week*. 1595, 1596. H. 24, 28.

Seven Days of the Week, The, Com. The Christmas Prince, 1607. *Miscellanea Antiqua Anglicana*, i, 1816.

*Seven Deadly Sins, The, Second Part of the*, Medley Drama. Tarlton, R. Before 1588. Platte or plan alone extant. See Malone, iii, 348.

*Seven Wise Masters*. Dekker, Haughton, Day, Chettle. 1600. H. 118.

Sforza, The Tragedy of Lodovick. Gomersal, R. Pr. 1628.

*She Saint, The*, "a play." Daborne, R. 1613. *Alleyn Papers*, 82.

Shepherds' Holiday, The, Past. Rutter, J. 1634, 1635. Dodsley, xii.

*Shepherds' Masque, The*. Mentioned in Mucedorus, ed. 1606. Fleay, ii, 49. Halliwell, 225.

Shepherds' Paradise, The, Past. Montague, W. 1632, 1659.

*Ship, The*. Before 1611. Mentioned in Amends for Ladies, II, i.

Shoemaker a Gentleman, A, Pseudo-Chron. Rowley, W. 1610, 1638.

Shoemakers' Holiday, The, Com. Dekker, T. 1597–99, 1600.

*Shore, Jane*. Chettle, H. 1598. H. 160.

*Shore's Wife*, Chron. Day, Chettle. 1603. H. 190.

Sicelides, Piscatory. Fletcher, P. 1615, 1631. Grosart's ed. of P. Fletcher, iii.

Sicily and Naples, or the Fatal Union, Trag. Harding, S. 1638, 1640.

Siderothriambos, Civic Pageant. Munday, A. 1618.

Siege, The (earlier called The Colonel), T. C. Davenant, Sir W. 1629. Folio, 1673, under title The Siege.

Siege, The, or Love's Convert, T. C. Cartwright, W. 1637. *Comedies*, etc. 1651.

Siege of Antwerp, The. See A Larum for London.

*Siege of Dunkirk, with Alleyn the Pirate*. 1603. H. 174.

*Siege of London*, Chron. 1594. H. 21. Qy. Heywood's Edward IV.

*Sight and Search.* 1643. MS. See Halliwell, 228.

Silent Woman, The. See Epicœne.

Silvanus, Lat. Com. Cambridge, 1596. *Bodleian MS. Douce*, 234.

Silver Age, The. (Hercules.) Heywood, T. 1595, 1613.

*Silvia*, Lat. Com. Kynder, P. 1625–42. Alluded to in *MS. Ashmole*, 788.

*Singer's Voluntary.* Singer, J. 1602. H. 173. Cf. Day's Humor Out of Breath, iv, 3.

Sir Clyomon, Giles Goosecap, etc. See Clyomon, Goosecap, etc.

Sisters, The, Com. Shirley, J. Lic. 1642. *Six New Plays*, 1653.

*Sisters of Mantua, The.* 1578. Revels, 125.

*Six Clothiers of the West.* One with 2, *Six Yeomen of the West.*

*Six Fools*, Com.? 1567–68. Mentioned, *Harl. MS.* 146. Collier, i, 194.

*Six Seamen, Masque of.* 1582. Revels, 178.

*Six Virtues, Masque of.* 1574. Collier, i, 209.

1, *Six Yeomen of the West*, Murder Play. Day, Rowley, S., Haughton. 1601. H. 137, 138.

2, *Six Yeomen* (or *Clothiers*) *of the West*, Murder Play. Hathway, Smith, Haughton. 1601. H. 150.

*Skink, Sir Martin*, Com. Brome, R., Heywood, T. 1634? S. R. 1634.

*Skogan and Skelton.* Rankins, Hathway, Rowley, S. 1601. H. 125, 134.

*Soldan and the Duke of ——, The History of the.* 1580. Revels, 155.

*Soldier, The*, Trag. Lovelace, R. Before 1642.

*Soldiered Citizen, The.* See *The Crafty Merchant.*

Soliman and Perseda, Trag. Kyd, T. 1588, 1599.

*Solitary Knight, History of the.* 1577. Revels, 114.

Solymannidæ, Lat. Trag. of palace intrigue. 1581. *Brit. Mus. MS. Lansdowne*, 723. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv.

Somebody, Avarice and Minister. Politico-Religious Intl.

(Brandl, lix). 1547–53, n. d. Fragment. See S. R. Maitland, *List of Early Printed Books at Lambeth*, 1843, 280.
Somerset's Masque. See Whitehall. Campion.
*Somnium Fundatoris*, an Allegorical Show. The Christmas Prince, 1607.
Sophister, The, Com. Zouch, R. Oxford, 1638, 1639. Greg, ii, p. xxix.
Sophomorus, Com.? 1620. *Bliss MS.* Fleay, ii, 361.
Sophonisba. See The Wonder of Women.
Sophy, The, Trag. Denham, Sir J. 1641, 1642.
Spaniard's Night Walk, The. See Blurt, Master Constable.
Spanish Bawd, represented in Celestina, The, T. C., Tr. Rojas. Mabbe, J. Not acted, 1631.
*Spanish Comedy, The.* 1591. H. 13.
Spanish Curate, The, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1622. Folio, 1647.
*Spanish Duke of Lerma, The*, Hist.? Shirley, H. Before 1627. S. R. 1653.
*Spanish Fig, The*, Trag. 1602. H. 153. Fleay, ii, 308, identifies with The Noble Spanish Soldier.
Spanish Gipsy, The. Middleton, Rowley, W. 1623, 1653.
Spanish Lovers, The, T. C. Davenant, Sir W. S. R. 1639 as The Distresses. Folio, 1672. Fleay, i, 103.
*Spanish Maz, The Tragedy of the.* 1605. Revels, 205. Of doubtful authenticity. See Fleay, *Stage*, 177.
*Spanish Moor's Tragedy, The.* Dekker, Haughton, Day. 1600. H. 118. Perhaps Lust's Dominion.
*Spanish Puecas* (Fleay, ii, 336) or *Purchase, The*, Com. Warburton.
Spanish Tragedy, The. Kyd, T. 1586, 1594.
*Spanish Viceroy, The, or the Honor of Women*, Com. Massinger, P. 1624. S. R. Sept. 1653. Warburton.
Sparagus Garden, The, Com. Brome, R. 1635, 1640.
*Spartan Ladies, The*, T. C. Carlell, L. 1634. S. R. 1646. Mentioned in *Mildmay's Diary*, Collier, ii, 63.
*Spensers, The*, Chron. Chettle, Porter. 1599. H. 103.
Spightful Sister, The, T. C. Baily, A. Before 1640? 1667.

Spring's Glory, The, Masque. Nabbes, T. May, 1638, 1638. Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s. ii, 256.

*Spurius*, Lat. Com. Heylin, P. Oxford, 1615. *Retros. Rev.* xii, 8.

Squire's Masque, The. See Whitehall, Masque at, at the Marriage of the Earl of Somerset.

Staple of News, The. Jonson, B. 1625. Folio, 1631–40.

*Stark Flattery*, Com. 1598. H. ed. Collier, 276.

*Stephen, The History of King.* "By W. Shakespeare." S. R. June, 1660.

*Stepmother's Tragedy*, Murder Play. Dekker, Chettle. 1599. H. 110.

Stoicus Vapulans, Lat. Moral. Cambridge, 1627, 1648. *Retros. Rev.* xii, 29, 35.

*Stonehenge*, Past.? Speed, J. 1636. See *Athen. Oxon.* ii, 660.

Strange Discovery, The, T. C. Gough, J. 1640.

*Strange News out of Poland.* Haughton, "Mr. Pett." 1600. H. 121.

*Strowde, Thomas.* See 2 and 3, *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green.*

Studely, Pastoral Dialogue at. 1592. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 142.

Stukeley, The Famous History of Captain Thomas, Biog. Chron. 1596 (H. 50), 1605. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, i.

Suffolk, The Duchess of. See The Duchess of Suffolk.

Suffolk and Norfolk, The Queen's Entertainment in. 1578. Churchyard, T. n. d. See Nichols, *Elizabeth*, ii, 136.

Summer's Last Will and Testament, Court Drama. Nash, T. 1592, 1600. Dodsley, viii.

Sun in Aries, The, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1621.

Sun's Darling, The, "a Moral Masque." Ford, Dekker. 1623, 1656.

*Supposed Inconstancy, The.* S. R. 1653. Halliwell, 239.

Supposes, Tr. Ariosto. Gascoigne, G. 1566. *A Hundreth Sundry Flowers*, n. d. [1566].

*Susanna, The Comedy of the Most Virtuous.* Garter, T. S. R. 1568–69, 1578. See Greg, ii, p. cxxiii.

*Susanna's Tears.* Listed, 1656. Perhaps Garter's *Virtuous Susanna.* See Greg, ii, p. cix.

Swaggering Damsel, The, Com. Man. Chamberlain, R. 1640.

Swetnam the Woman Hater Arraigned by Women, Rom. and Sat'l. Com. 1618–19, 1620. Repr. Grosart, 1880.

Swisser, The, T. C. Wilson, A. 1631. Ed. A. Feuillerat, Paris, 1904.

[*Sylla Dictator*], Hist. 1588. See Collier, i, 266.

Sylvanus, Monologue. Gascoigne, G. Kenilworth, 1575. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, i, 575.

Tale of a Tub, A. Com. Jonson, B. 1601? Lic. 1633. Folio, 1640.

1, *Tamber Cam*, Conqueror Play. 1588–92 (H. 14). Plot extant. See Malone, iii, 356.

2, *Tamber Cam*, Conqueror Play. 1592. H. 42.

1, 2, Tamburlaine the Great, Conqueror Play. Marlowe, C. 1587, 1592.

Tamer Tamed, The. See The Woman's Prize.

Taming of a Shrew, The, Com. Intl. 1588, 1594. Repr. *Sh. Quartos*, 1886.

Taming of the Shrew, The, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1596–97. Folio, 1623.

Tancred and Gismunda, Trag. Senecan. Wilmot, R., and others. 1568, 1591. Dodsley, vii.

*Tancredo*, Trag. Wotton, Sir H. Oxford, 1586–87. See Ward, i, 215, and Walton's *Life of Wotton.*

*Tanner of Denmark, The.* 1592. H. 14.

*Tararantantara*, Sat'l. Com. Nash, T. Before 1590, Cambridge. Nash, *Have with you to Saffron Walden*, 117.

*Tasso.* Revised by Dekker. 1594, 1602. H. 19, 171.

*Tasso's Melancholy.* 1594. H. 18.

Technogamia, or the Marriages of the Arts, Moral. Holiday, B. 1618. See Nichols, *James*, iii, 713.

*Telemo, A History of.* 1583. Revels, 177.

Tell Tale, Com. Before 1625. See Warner, *Cat. of Dulwich*, p. 342, and Bullen, *Old Plays*, ii, 417.

Tempe Restored, Masque. Townsend, A. 1632. See Brotanek, 362.

Tempest, The, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1610–11. Folio, 1623.

Temple of Love, The, Masque. Davenant, Sir W. 1634 [35].

*Terminus et Non Terminus*, Lat. Com. Nash, T. 1588. See Grosart, *Harvey*, iii, 67.

Tethy's Festival or the Queen's Wake. Daniel, S. 1610.

*That will be shall be.* 1596. H. 50.

*Theagenes and Chariclea.* 1573. Revels, 34.

Theater of Apollo, The, Entertainment. 1625. *Brit. Mus. Bibl. Reg.* 18 A. lxx.

Thebais, Tr. Newton, T. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

Thenot and Piers, A Dialogue between. Pembroke, Countess of. 1601. Nichols, *Elizabeth*, iii, 529.

Theobald's, Entertainment of the King and Queen at. Jonson, B. 1607. Folio, 1616.

Theobald's, Entertainment of Two Kings at. Jonson, B. 1606. Folio, 1616.

Theobald's, Queen Elizabeth's Welcome at. Peele, G. 1591, 1833 in Collier, i, 383.

Theomachia, Lat. Moral. Heylin, P. Oxford, 1618. See *Retros. Rev.* xii, 8.

Thibaldus sive Vindictæ Ingenium, Tragœdia, Lat. Snelling, T. Oxford, 1640. See *Jahrbuch*, xxvii, 228.

Thierry and Theodoret, Trag. Hist. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Massinger. 1617, 1621.

Thracian Wonder, The, Com. "Webster, J., and Rowley, W." 1598 (Fleay, i, 287). *Two New Plays*, 1661.

*Three Brothers*, or *Two Brothers*. Smith, W. 1602. H. 182.

Three Ladies of London, The, Moral. Wilson, R. 1583, 1584. Dodsley, vi.

Three Laws of Nature, Moses and Christ, Miracle. Bale, J. 1538, 1562.

Three Lords and Three Ladies of London, The, Moral. Wilson, R. 1585, 1590. Dodsley, vi.

*Three Plays in One.* 1585. Revels, 189.

*Three Sisters of Mantua.* 1578. Revels, 125.

Thyestes, Tr. Heywood, Jasper. 1560. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

Tide Tarrieth no Man, The, Moral. Wapull, G. 1576. Ed. Collier, *Illustrations of Popular Literature*, 1864, ii, no. 4.

Time, The Triumph of. See The Triumph of Time.

*Time's Complaint, The Comedy of.* See The Christmas Prince, 1607.

*Time Triumphant*, Entertainment. 1603. S. R. 1604.

Time Vindicated, Masque. Jonson, B. 1623. Folio, 1640.

*Time's Triumph, and Fort[unat]us.* 1597. H. 52. See The Triumph of Time, and *Fortunatus*.

*Timoclea at Thebes.* 1574. Revels, 62.

Timon, Trag. 1600. *Sh. Soc.* 1842.

Timon of Athens. Shakespeare, W., Wilkins, G.? 1607. Folio, 1623.

*Tinker of Totness*, Com. 1596. H. 42.

*'Tis Good Sleeping in a Whole Skin*, Com. Wager, W. 1566. Perhaps one with The Cruel Debtor.

*'Tis no Deceit to Deceive the Deceiver.* Chettle, H. 1598. H. 99.

'Tis Pity She's a Whore, Trag. Ford, J. 1627, 1633.

*Tito Andronico und der hoffertigen Kayserin.* 1586. *Englische Comoedien und Tragoedien*, 1620. Perhaps one with *Titus and Vespacia*, 1591. H. 14.

*Titus and Gisippus.* 1577. Revels, 114, 120.

*Titus and Ondronicus*, Trag. 1594. H. 16.

*Titus and Vespasian*, Trag. 1591. H. 14.

Titus Andronicus, Trag. Shakespeare, W. 1588–90, 1594.

*Tobias.* Chettle, H. 1602. H. 166.

*Tom Bedlam the Tinker*, Com. 1618. Fleay, ii, 328.

Tom Tyler and his Wife, Dom. Intl. 1550–69, 1661. Ed. F. E. Schelling, *Mod. Lang. Publ.* xv, 1900.

Tomumbeius sive Sultanici in Ægypto Imperii Eversio, Lat. Trag., Conqueror Play. Salterne, G. Before 1603. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 247.

*Too Good to be True, or the Poor Northern Man*, Com.? Chettle, Hathway, Smith. 1601. H. 151.

*Tooly*. 1576. Revels, 102.

*Toothdrawer, The*. Advertised, 1661.

Tottenham Court, Com. Man. Nabbes, T. 1633, 1638. Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s. i.

*Toy, The*. Prologue by Shirley. *Poems*, 1646.

*Toy to Please Chaste Ladies, A*, Com. 1595. H. 27.

Traitor, The, Trag. Shirley, J. Lic. 1631, 1635.

Trapolin Supposed a Prince, T. C., Tr. Italian. Cockayne, Sir A. Before 1640. *Small Poems*, 1658.

Travails of Three English Brothers, The, Chron. Day, Rowley, W., Wilkins. 1607. Bullen, *Day*, ii.

Tres Sibyllæ, Intl. Gwinne, M. 1605. With Vertumnus, 1607. See *Variorum Macbeth*, ed. 1903, p. 397.

Trial of Chivalry, The, Pseudo-Hist. 1597–1604, 1605. Perhaps identical with *Burbon*, H. 54. Bullen, *Old Plays*, iii.

Trial of Treasure, The, Moral. 1565, 1567. Dodsley, iii.

*Triangle, or Triplicity of Cuckolds*, Com. Dekker. 1598. H. 84.

Trick to Catch the Old One, A, Com. Man. Middleton, T. 1606, 1608.

*Tristram de Lyons*, Rom. 1599. H. 112.

Triumph of Beauty, The, Masque. Shirley, J. Before 1642? *Poems*, 1646.

Triumph of Death, The, Trag. Beaumont and Fletcher. 1608. See Four Plays in One. Folio, 1647.

Triumph of Honor, The, Com. Beaumont and Fletcher. 1608. See Four Plays in One. Folio, 1647.

Triumph of Love, The, Com. Beaumont and Fletcher. 1608. See Four Plays in One. Folio, 1647.

Triumph of Time, The, Moral Intl. Beaumont and Fletcher. 1608. See Four Plays in One. Folio, 1647.

Triumphs of Integrity, Truth, etc. See Integrity, Truth, etc.

Troas, Tr. Heywood, Jasper. 1559. *Seneca his Ten Tragedies*, 1581. Repr. Spenser Soc. 1887.

Troia Nova Triumphans, Civic Pageant. Dekker, T. 1612.

*Troilus and Cressida*, Trag. Dekker, Chettle. 1599. H. 104.

Troilus and Cressida, T. C. Shakespeare, W. 1601–02, 1609.

Troublesome Reign of John, The. See John, The Troublesome Reign of.

*Troy*. 1596. H. 42. Probably Heywood's Iron Age. Fleay, i, 285.

*Troy's Revenge, with the Tragedy of Polyphemus*. Chettle, 1599. H. 102.

True Tragedy of Richard, Duke of York, The. See 2, Contention.

True Tragedy of Richard III. See Richard III, The True Tragedy of.

True Trojans, The. See Fuimus Troes.

Truth, The Triumphs of, Civic Pageant. Middleton, T. 1613.

*Truth, Faithfulness and Mercy*. 1574. Revels, 51.

*Truth's Supplication to Candlelight*. Dekker, T. 1600. H. 58.

Tu Quoque. See Greene's Tu Quoque.

Turk, The. See Mulleasses, the Turk.

*Turkish Mahomet and Hiren the Fair Greek, The*, Pseudo-Hist. Peele, G. 1594. Mentioned in *Merry Conceited Jests of Peele*, 1607.

Twelfth Night, or What You Will, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1600–02. Folio, 1623.

*Twelve Labors of Hercules, The*. Mentioned in Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, 1592.

Twelve Months, The Masque of the. 1612. *Life of Inigo Jones and Five Court Masques*, ed. Collier, *Sh. Soc.* 1848. See Brotanek, 346.

Twins, The, T. C. Rider, W. After 1629, 1655. (A revision of the following.)

*Twins' Tragedy, The.* Niccols, R. S. R. 1612. Revels, 211.

1, Two Angry Women of Abington, The, Com. Porter, H. 1596–98, 1599. H. 100. Gayley.

2, *Two Angry Women of Abington*, Com. Porter. 1598. H. 100.

Two Gentlemen of Verona, The, Com. Shakespeare, W. 1591–92. Folio, 1623.

*Two Harpies* (Collier) or *Shapes* (Greg). Drayton, Dekker, Middleton, Webster, Munday. 1602. H. 167.

Two Italian Gentlemen, Com. Tr.? Munday, A. 1582, 1584. Repr. in part by Halliwell-Phillipps, *Literature*, 1849.

*Two Kings in a Cottage*, Trag. Bonen, W. Lic. 1623. See Fleay, i, 32.

Two Lamentable Tragedies, Murder Play. Yarington, R. 1599, 1601. Bullen, *Old Plays*, iv.

Two Maids of More-clake, The, Com. Man. Armin, R. 1608, 1609.

Two Merry Milkmaids, The. Cumber, J. 1619, 1620.

*Two Merry Women of Abington*, Com. Porter, H. 1598. H. 103.

Two Noble Kinsmen, The. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Shakespeare. 1612, 1634.

Two Noble Ladies, The, or the Converted Conjurer, T. C. 1619–22. *Brit. Mus. MS. Egerton*, 1994. See Bullen, *Old Plays*, ii, 430.

Two Sins of King David, The, Bible Play. S. R. 1562. But see Fleay, ii, 293, where this is identified with David and Absalom by Bale and declared still extant in MS.

Two the Most Faithfullest Friends. See Damon and Pithias.

Two Tragedies in One. See Two Lamentable Tragedies.

Two Wise Men and All the Rest Fools, Com. Man. 1619.

Tyranical Government Anatomized, Tr. of Buchanan's Baptistes. 1642. Herford, 114 n.

*Tyrant, The*, "Trag. Massinger, P." Warburton. S. R. June, 1660. Perhaps one with *The King and Subject*. Lic. June, 1638. See Malone, iii, 230.

Ulysses and Circe. See Inner Temple Masque. Browne.
*Ulysses Redux*, Lat. Trag. Gager, W. 1580, 1592. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 238.
*Unfortunate Fortunate, The*, T. C. Garfield, B. Mentioned by R. Baron in *Pocula Castalia*, 1650.
*Unfortunate General, French History of the*. Hathway, Smith, Day. 1603. H. 186.
Unfortunate Lovers, The, Trag. Davenant, Sir W. 1638, 1643.
Unfortunate Mother, The, Trag. Nabbes, T. 1638–39, 1640. Bullen, *Old Plays*, n. s.
*Unfortunate Piety, The, or the Italian Night Piece*. Massinger, P. Lic. 1631. S. R. 1653. See Fleay, i, 225.
Unhappy Fair Irene, The, Trag. Swinhoe, G. Before 1640, 1658.
Unnatural Combat, The, Trag. Massinger, P. 1621, 1639.
Untrussing of the Humorous Poet. See Satiromastix.
Usurping Tyrant, The. See The Second Maiden's Tragedy.
*Usury Put to Use*. See *The Devil of Dowgate*.
*Utherpendragon*, Chron. 1597. H. 52.

*Valentine and Orson*, Rom. Hathway, Munday. S. R. 1595, 1598. H. 90.
Valentinian, Hist. Trag. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1617. Folio, 1647.
Valetudinarium, Com. Johnson, W. Cambridge, 1638. MS. in St. John's Coll. See *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 286.
*Valiant Scholar, The*. Lic. 1622.
Valiant Scot, The, Chron. "J. W." 1637. Forthcoming ed. by J. L. Carver, Penna. Thesis, 1905.
Valiant Welshman, The, Chron. Armin, R. 1595, 1615.
*Vallia and Antony*. 1595. H. 21.
*Valteger*, or *Vortigern*, Chron. 1596. H. 50.

Variety, The, Com. Man. Cavendish, W., Duke of Newcastle. 1638. *Two Comedies*, 1649.

*Vayvode*. Chettle, H. 1598. H. 94.

"*Vely* a *for*" [sic]. 1594. H. 21.

*Venetian Comedy*. 1594. H. 19.

*Venus, the White Tragedy or the Green Knight*, Heroical Rom. Philips. Mentioned in Nash's *Lenten Stuff*, 1599.

*Versipellis*, Lat. Com. Pestell, T. 1631. College unknown. *Biog. Dram.* ii, 566.

Vertumnus. See Alba.

Very Woman, A, T. C. Massinger, P. Revised 1634. *Three New Plays*, 1655.

*Vestal, The*, Trag. Glapthorne, H. *C.* 1639. Warburton.

Vice, An Interlude of. See Horestes.

*Vices, The Masque of*. Date unknown. Music in *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10338, fol. 28*b*. Brotanek, 339.

Victoria, Com. Fraunce, A. 1583. Ed. G. C. Moore Smith, 1906.

Vindicta. See Adrasta Parentans.

Virgin Martyr, The, Trag. Massinger, Dekker. Lic. 1620, 1622.

Virgin Widow, The, Com. Man. Quarles, F. Before 1642, 1649. Grosart, *Quarles*, iii.

Virtue and Beauty Reconciled, Masque. 1625. Fleay, ii, 345.

*Virtues, Masque of Six*. 1574. Fleay, ii, 341.

Virtuous Octavia. See Octavia.

Vision of Delight, The, Masque. Jonson, B. 1617. Folio, 1640.

Vision of the Twelve Goddesses, The, Masque. Daniel, S. 1604.

Vittoria Corombona. See The White Devil.

Volpone, or The Fox, Com. Man. Jonson, B. 1606, 1607.

*Vortigern*. See *Valteger*.

*Vow and a Good One, A*. Acted, 1623. Fleay, ii, 98, believes this one with A Fair Quarrel.

Vow Breaker, The, or the Fair Maid of Clifton, Dom. Trag. Sampson, W. 1636.

Walks of Islington and Hogsdon, The, Com, Man. Jordan, T. 1641, 1657.

Wallenstein, Albertus, Trag. Glapthorne, H. 1634–38, 1639.

Wandering Lovers, The, T. C. Fletcher, J. Lic. Dec. 1623. Warburton. S. R. Sept. 1653. One with The Lovers' Progress.

Wanstead, Entertainment of her Majesty at. Sidney, Sir P. 1578. *Arcadia*, ed. 1598.

*War without Blows, and Love without Suit*, or *Strife*. Heywood, T. 1599. H. 101.

Warbeck, Perkin. See Perkin Warbeck.

Ward, The, T. C. Neale, T. 1637. *Bodleian MS. Rawl. Poet.* 79.

Ward and Dansiker. See The Christian Turned Turk.

*Warlamchester*. 1594. H. 20.

Warning for Fair Women, A. Murder Play. 1598, 1599. Simpson, *School of Shakspere*, ii.

Wars of Cyrus, The, Hist. Trag. 1588–91, 1594. Repr. *Jahrbuch*, xxxvii, 1901.

Wars of Pompey and Cæsar, The, Trag. Chapman, G. 1604–1608? 1631.

*Way to Content all Women, The*, Com. Gunnell, R. Lic. 1624.

Weakest Goeth to the Wall, The, Pseudo-Hist. "Webster and Dekker." 1600.

Wealth and Health, Intl. 1557. Ed. W. W. Greg, Malone Society, 1907.

Wedding, The, Com. Man. Shirley, J. 1626, 1629.

Weeding of Covent Garden, The, or the Middlesex Justice of Peace, Com. Brome, R. 1632. *Five New Plays*, 1659.

Welbeck, The King's Entertainment at. 1633. Folio, 1640.

Welsh Ambassador, The, Chron. 1623. See Halliwell, 269.

*Welsh Traveller*. See *The Witch Traveller*.

*Welshman, The*. Drayton, Chettle. 1595. H. 27, 85.

*Welshman's Prize, The*. See *The Welshman*.

Westward Hoe, Com. Man. Dekker, Webster. 1603–04, 1607.

*What Mischief Worketh in the Mind of Man*, Moral. Mentioned in *Northbrooke's Treatise*, 1578. *Notes and Queries*, IX, ii, 444.

What you Will, Com. Man. Marston, J. 1601, 1607.

*What will be shall be.* See *That will be shall be.*

When Women go to Law. See The Devil's Law Case.

When You See Me You Know Me, Chron. Rowley, S. 1604, 1605. Ed. K. Elze, 1874.

Whimsies of Senor Hidalgo or the Masculine Bride, Com.? Before 1603. *Brit. Mus. MS. Harl.* 5152.

*Whisperer, The, or What You Please.* Prologue by Tatham (pr. with Ostella, 1650) alone extant.

White Devil, The, or Vittoria Corombona, Trag. Webster, J. 1611, 1612.

Whitehall, Masque at, at the Marriage of the Earl of Somerset. Campion, T. 1614. Bullen's *Campion*, 1889.

Whitehall, Masque at, in Honor of the Marriage of Lord Hayes. Campion, T. 1607. Bullen's *Campion*, 1889.

Whitehall, Masque at, February, 1612. See The Inner Temple and Gray's Inn Masque.

Whitehall, Masque at, February, 1613. See The Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn Masque.

*Whittington, The History of Richard.* S. R. 1605.

Who Would Have Thought It. See Law Tricks.

Whole Contention, The. See Contention betwixt the Two Famous Houses of York and Lancaster; The First Part of the, and Richard Duke of York, The True Tragedy of.

*Whore in Grain, The*, Trag. Lic. 1624. See Fleay, ii, 273, and his *Stage*, 358.

*Whore New Vamped, The*, Sat'l. Com. 1639. See Collier, ii, 94.

Whore of Babylon, The, Allegorical Chron. Dekker, T. 1604, 1607.

Widow, The, Com. "Jonson, Fletcher, Middleton." 1616–25, 1652.

Widow of Watling Street, The. See The Puritan.

*Widow's Charm.* Munday, or Wadeson. 1602. H. 169.

*Widow's Prize, The*, Com. Sampson, W. 1624–26. (Halliwell; see Fleay, ii, 175.) S. R. Sept. 1653. Warburton.
Widow's Tears, The, Com. Chapman, G. 1605, 1612.
Wife for a Month, A, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. Lic. 1624. Folio, 1647.
Wild Goose Chase, The, Com. Man. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1621, 1652.
*Wild Men, Masque of.* Greenwich, 1573. See Fleay, ii, 341.
*Will of a Woman, The.* Chapman, G. 1598. H. 88.
*William Longsword*, or *Longbeard.* Drayton, M. 1599. H. 59, 100.
*William the Conqueror*, Chron. 1594. H. 16.
Wily Beguiled, Com. Peele, G.? Before 1595, 1606. Dodsley, ix.
Wine, Beer and Ale, Dialog. 1629.
Winter's Tale, The, "Romance." Shakespeare, W. 1610–11. Folio, 1623.
Wisdom of Doctor Dodypoll, The. Peele, G.? Before 1596, 1600. Bullen, *Old Plays*, iii.
*Wise Man of Westchester.* 1594. H. 20.
Wise Woman of Hogsdon, The, Dom. Heywood, T. 1604, 1638.
Wit and Will, Moral. At Court, 1568. Perhaps a revival of Wit and Science, 1541–48. See Collier, i, 194.
Wit at Several Weapons, Com. Man. (Beaumont and) Fletcher, Rowley, W. 1608–09. Folio, 1647.
Wit in a Constable, Com. Man. Glapthorne, H. 1639, 1640.
*Wit in a Madness*, Com. Brome, R. S. R. 1640.
Wit of a Woman, The, Com. Man. 1604.
Wit without Money, Com. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1614, 1639.
Witch, The, T. C. Middleton, T. Before 1627. Ed. I. Reed, 1778.
Witch of Edmonton, The, Dom. Rowley, W., Dekker, Ford. 1621, 1658.
*Witch of Islington.* 1597. H. 54.

*Witch Traveller, The.* Lic. 1623. Halliwell reads *Welsh Traveller.*

*Witless,* Moral Intl. S. R. 1560–61.

Wits, The, Com. Man. Davenant, Sir W. 1634, 1636.

Witty Fair One, The, Com. Man. Shirley, J. 1628, 1633.

Wizard, The, Com.? Before 1603. *Brit. Mus. MS. Addit.* 10306.

*Wolsey, The Life of,* Chron. Munday, Chettle, Drayton, Smith. 1601. H. 138.

1, *Wolsey, The Rising of,* Chron. Chettle, Drayton, Munday, Smith. 1601. H. 147.

2, *Wolsey, The Second Part of.* Chettle, Rowley. 1602. H. 167.

*Woman, Play of a.* See *Woman's Tragedy.*

Woman Hater, The, Com. Beaumont (and Fletcher). 1606, 1607.

Woman in the Moon, The, Court Drama. Lyly, J. 1591–93, 1597.

Woman is a Weather-cock, A, Com. Field, N. 1611, 1612. *Nero and Other Plays,* Mermaid ed. 1888.

Woman Killed with Kindness, A. Dom. Drama. Heywood, T. 1603, 1607.

*Woman,* or *Women, Hard to Please.* 1597. H. 51.

Woman will have her Will, A. See Englishmen for my Money.

*Woman's Law, The.* S. R. 1653. Halliwell, 276.

*Woman's Masterpiece, The.* S. R. 1653. Halliwell, 277.

*Woman's Mistaken, The,* Com.? Davenport, Drue. 1622. S. R. 1653.

*Woman's Plot, The,* Com. Massinger, P. Before 1640. Warburton. S. R. Sept. 1653. See Fleay, i, 215, 227.

Woman's Prize, The, or the Tamer Tamed. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1606. Folio, 1647.

*Woman's too Hard for Him, The,* Com. 1622. Fleay, i, 215.

*Woman's Tragedy.* Chettle, H. 1598. H. 90.

Women Beware Women, Trag. Middleton, T. 1612. *Two New Plays,* 1657.

Women Pleased, T. C. (Beaumont and) Fletcher. 1620. Folio, 1647.
Wonder of a Kingdom, The. Dekker, Day? 1623, 1636.
*Wonder of a Woman.* 1595. H. 25.
Wonder of Women, The, or the Tragedy of Sophonisba. Marston, J. 1603, 1606.
Woodstock, The Queen's Entertainment at. Gascoigne, G. 1575, 1585.
Woodstock, The Tragedy of Thomas of. See Richard II.
*Wooer, The,* Intl. Puttenham, G. Before 1589. *Art of Poesie,* ed. Arber, 233.
*Wooing of Death.* Chettle, H. 1600. H. 121.
*Worcester, Entertainment at.* Heywood, Wyatt, R. 1575. Nichols, *Elizabeth,* i, 537.
Work for Cutlers, Dialog. 1615.
*World, The.* Mentioned in Beeston's List, 1639. See Collier, ii, 92.
World Runs Well on Wheels, The, Com. Chapman. 1599. H. 101. Perhaps All Fools.
World Tost at Tennis, The, Masque. Middleton, Rowley, W. 1620.
*World's Tragedy, The.* 1595. H. 25.
*Worse 'feared than Hurt.* See *Hannibal and Hermes.*
Wounds of Civil War, The, or Marius and Sulla, Anc. Hist. Lodge, T. 1587–90, 1594. Dodsley, vii.
Wyatt, Sir Thomas, Chron. Dekker, T. 1602, 1607.

*Xerxes, King.* Ferrant, R. 1574–75. See Collier, i, 235.

*Yorkshire Gentlewoman and her Son, The,* Trag. Chapman, G. Before 1634. S. R. June, 1660. Warburton.
Yorkshire Tragedy, A, Murder Play. 1605, 1608.
Young Admiral, The, Com. Shirley, J. Lic. 1633, 1637.
*Younger Brother, The,* Com.? 1607. Mentioned in *Alleyn's Diary.* Malone, iii, 223.
Your Five Gallants, Com. Man. Middleton, T. Lic. 1607, n. d.

*Yule-tide*, Com. Oxford, 1608. See M. L. Lee, *Narcissus*, 1893, p. xiv.

Zabeta, Court Intl. Gascoigne, G. 1575. *The Princely Pleasures at Kenilworth*, 1576.
Zelotypus, Lat. Com. Cambridge, 1600–03. MS. Emmanuel College. *Jahrbuch*, xxxiv, 313.
Zeno, Lat. Trag. Simeon, J. Cambridge, 1631, 1648.
*Zenobia*. 1592. H. 13.
*Zulziman*, Hist.? Mentioned in Satiromastix, 1602.

# INDEX


Abelard, i, 8.
Aberdeen, i, 494.
*Abraham and Isaac*, i, 22; ii, 443.
*Abraham's Sacrifice*, i, 39; ii, 446.
*Abram and Lot*, i, 42.
*Absalom*, i, 550.
*Absalon*, i, 37; ii, 55, 56.
*Abuses*, i, 285.
Academic drama. See *Drama* and *College drama*.
Accoramboni, Vittoria, i, 409.
*Acolastus*, i, 35, 63–65, 81, 94; ii, 446, 519.
*Actæon and Diana*, ii, 170.
Actors. See *Players*.
"Actor-playwright," the, i, 187–192; ii, 375, 376.
Adams, J. Q., Jr., i, 204, 205, 534.
Adamson, Patrick, i, 38.
*Adelphe*, ii, 75.
*Adelphi*, i, 461.
Admiral's players, i, 145, 146, 168, 169, 198, 224, 313, 314, 365, 412, 422, 460, 466, 472, 495, 509, 557; ii, 22, 377–379.
Ælian, i, 439.
*Æmilia*, ii, 75, 81.
Æschylus, ii, 1.
Æsop, i, 215, 216.
*Agamemnon*, i, 344, 385, 577; ii, 21.
*Agamemnon and Ulysses*, i, 123; ii, 3.
Agas, Ralph, i, 157.
Agincourt, i, xxxix.
*Aglaura*, i, 449, 450; ii, 182, 362.
Ainsworth, William, ii, 75.
*Ajax*, ii, 56.
*Ajax and Ulysses*, i, 118; ii, 43, 402.
*Ajax Flagellifer*, ii, 56, 72.
Alabaster, William, i, 577; ii, 76, 402, 519.
*Alaham*, i, 448, 577; ii, 11, 340, 496.
*Alba*, ii, 72, 79.
Albertus Alasco, Prince Palatine of Poland, ii, 59.
*Albion Knight*, i, 70, 255; ii, 470.
*Albion's England*, i, 250.
*Albion's Triumph*, ii, 130.
*Albovine*, i, 410; ii, 341, 425, 536.
*Albumazar*, ii, 78.
*Alcazar, Battle of*. See *Battle of Alcazar*.
*Alcestis*, i, 34, 83; ii, 2.
*Alchemist*, i, xxxv, 168, 170, 206, 469, 470, 505, 508, 531, 539–542; ii, 29, 78, 103, 110, 283, 317, 319, 499.
*Alcmæon*, i, 118; ii, 3.
Aleman, Mateo, ii, 213.
Alençon, François, Duc d', i, 124, 127.
Alexander, Sir William, later Earl of Stirling, i, xxxii; ii, 7, 13–15, 22, 76, 411, 513.
Alexander VI, Pope, i, 410.
*Alexander VI, Life and Death of Pope*. See *Devil's Charter*.
*Alexander and Lodowick*, i, 379; ii, 20.
*Alexander, Campaspe, and Diogenes*. See *Campaspe*.
*Alexandræan Tragedy*, ii, 14.
*Alexias*, ii, 234.
*Alexius Imperator*, ii, 28.
Alfred the Great, i, 253.
*Alfredus*, i, 253; ii, 84.
*All Fools*, i, 461, 462; ii, 410, 494, 497.
*All for Money*, i, 68; ii, 402.
*All is True*, i, 290.
Allegory, use of, i, 51, 52, 121, 123, 124, 127–131, 139, 231, 289, 454; ii, 124, 266, 456, 501.
*Allesandro*, i, 462.
Alleyn, Edward, i, xxvi, 144, 160, 185, 196, 211, 224, 225, 313–317, 387, 483, 528; ii, 378.
*Alleyn Papers*, i, 409, 438, 460.
*All's Well That Ends Well*, i, 332, 333, 372, 380–383, 398, 403, 411; ii, 409, 491.
*Alphonsus of Aragon*, i, 194, 227, 228, 244, 406, 408, 428, 552.
*Alphonsus of Germany*, i, 136, 194, 228, 408, 437, 438, 453; ii, 496.
"Alternation theory" of Elizabethan staging, i, 164–166, 168.
*Althorpe, Entertainment at*, ii, 101, 102.
*Alucius*, i, 115.
*Amante Liberal*, ii, 206, 233.
Amateur performances, i, 521; playwrights, ii, 385.

Amazon, the, as a disguise, i, 533.
*Amazons, Masque of*, ii, 121.
Ambois, Cleremont D', ii, 413.
*Amends for Ladies*, i, 519, 520, 599; ii, 503.
*Ameto*, ii, 139.
*Aminta*, ii, 143, 144, 155, 156, 524, 525.
*Amorous War*, ii, 219, 278, 365, 366.
Amphitheatres, i, 156, 157; ii, 83.
*Amphitruo*, i, 83, 370, 458; ii, 497.
*Amphrissa*, ii, 152, 171.
*Amyntas*, i, 396; ii, 85, 87, 174, 175, 425, 519, 526.
Amyot, Jacques, ii, 6.
Anachronism, i, xxxii, 472; ii, 199.
Anckenbrand, H., i, 554, 578.
Ancre, Concino Concini, Marquis d', i, 424, 425, 590.
*Andrasta*, ii, 75.
*Andria*, i, 82.
*Andromana*, ii, 48, 179, 365, 537.
*Andronicus Comnenus*, ii, 28.
*Angel King*, i, 43, 406.
Angels, i, 386.
Anne of Denmark, queen of James I, ii, 104, 119, 123, 285; her players, i, 144, 145, 314, 357, 495, 496; ii, 242, 310, 383.
*Annunciation*, i, 10.
Antichrist, cycle of, i, 39.
*Anti-Christ*, miracle play of, i, 10.
*Antichristus*, i, 51; ii, 443.
*Antigone* (of Sophocles), ii, 2, 12; (of May), 44, 45, 76.
Antimasque, ii, 102, 108, 109, 111, 115, 118, 119, 124, 126, 129, 131, 133, 135.
*Antiphonarium*, i, 2.
*Antipodes*, ii, 270, 273, 282.
*Antiquary*, ii, 276.
*Antonie*, ii, 6, 7, 8, 512.
*Antonio and Mellida*, i, 436, 452, 483, 484, 486, 488, 555; ii, 2.
*Antonio and Vallia*, i, 379; ii, 229.
*Antonio of Ragusa*, i, 379.
*Antonio's Revenge*, i, 179, 555–558, 564, 578, 579; ii, 413.
*Antony*, i, 573.
*Antony and Cleopatra* (of Shakespeare), i, 185, 550, 572–574; ii, 6, 29, 30, 32, 413, 414, 515; (of Greville), i, 573.
*Anything for a Quiet Life*, i, 511, 512, 515, 579; ii, 244.
*Aphrodisial*, i, 465.
*Apocrypha*, i, 19, 21, 38.
*Apollo Shroving*, i, 66; ii, 82, 83.
Apollodorus, i, 132.
*Apollonius of Tyre*, ii, 30, 516.
*Apologetical Dialogue*, i, 486.
Appian, ii, 41.
*Appius and Virginia*, i, 198; (of Webster), i, 595, ii, 513; (of Bower), i, 72, 85, 120, ii, 16, 38.
*Apprentice's Prize*, ii, 262, 270.
*Ara Fortunæ*, ii, 73.
*Arabia Sitiens*, i, 465.
Arber, E. A., cited, i, 82, 84, 113, 149, 167, 172, 181, 209, 293; 434; ii, 56, 69.
*Arcades*, ii, 133, 523.
Arcadia, the conception of an ideal, ii, 140, 141, 153, 154.
*Arcadia* (of Shirley), ii, 171, 179, 314, 315.
*Arcadia Reformed*. See *Queen's Arcadia*.
*Arcadian Virgin*, ii, 153.
Archer, Francis, i, 237.
*Archipropheta sive Johannes Baptista*, i, 36, 37, 91; ii, 54, 446.
*Arden of Feversham*, i, xxix, 119, 194, 312, 318, 343–345, 347, 352, 365, 366, 404, 405, 455, 549; ii, 486.
Areopagus, the, ii, 10.
*Aresta Amorum*, ii, 255.
*Argalus and Parthenia*, ii, 176, 177, 179.
Argensola, Votolomé Leonardo, i, 430; ii, 211, 215, 216.
Ariel, ii, 203.
*Ariodante and Genevora*, i, 119, 200, 201, 211, 374.
Ariosto, i, 66, 99, 104, 119, 196, 200, 201, 374.
*Ariosto*, ii, 58.
Aristarchus, ii, 220.
*Aristippus*, ii, 85, 86.
Aristophanes, i, 445, 535, 539; ii, 46, 54, 55, 85, 265, 410.
Aristotle, i, 37; ii, 388, 389.
Armada, the Spanish, i, xxxix, 98, 194, 257, 262, 288, 376, 387, 465; ii, 191, 405.
Armin, Robert, i, 295, 302, 579; ii, 376, 379.
*Arraignment*. See *Poetaster*.
*Arraignment of London*, i, 499; ii, 241.
*Arraignment of Paris*, ii, 147, 412, 456.
Arthur, Prince, i, 74; ii, 97.
*Arthur, Life and Death of King*, i, 298.
Artour, Thomas, ii, 53.
Arundel, Lord, his players, i, 142.
*Arviragus and Philicia*, i, 303, 449; ii, 354, 356.

*As Plain as Can Be*, i, 119.
*As You Like It*, i, xxiv, 295, 310, 374, 375, 380; ii, 129, 139, 142, 154, 155, 412, 469, 489–491.
Ascham, Roger, i, 37, 61; ii, 2, 55, 56, 374.
Ashley, Sir John, ii, 243, 268.
Ashton, Thomas, ii, 83.
*Astrée*, ii, 169, 173, 178, 346.
*Astrologo*, ii, 78.
*Atalanta*, ii, 75.
*Athanasius*, i, 37.
*Atheist's Tragedy*, i, 564–566, 579, 604; ii, 413, 507.
Athelstan, i, 253, 284.
Atkinson, Thomas, ii, 75.
Aubrey, John, ii, 340, 361.
Audignier, Vital d', ii, 208.
*Augurs, Masque of*, ii, 123, 127.
*Aulularia*, i, 457; ii, 56.
*Aurelio y Isabella*, ii, 209, 238.
*Aureng-Zebe*, ii, 349.
Austria, English players in, ii, 391, 461.
Authorship, tests of, ii, 186–189.
Auvergne, Martial d', ii, 255.
Ayrer, J., ii, 490.

*Babes in the Woods*, i, 346.
Bacon, Francis, i, 102, 105, 106, 305, 353; ii, 4, 10, 94, 107, 109, 112, 117, 119, 185, 374.
Baeske, W., i, 279.
Bahlman, L. D., i, 64.
Bahlsen, L., ii, 205, 213.
Bailey, N., i, 82.
Baily, Abraham, ii, 303.
Baines, Richard, i, 236.
Baker, G. P., i, 124, 130, 220, 221, 599.
Balcony, use of the, i, 157, 158, 163, 164, 166, 168, 170, 171.
Bale, John, i, 31–33, 35, 37, 39, 43, 56, 59, 60, 70, 71, 91, 254, 255; ii, 375, 393, 395, 403, 445, 446, 450.
*Ball*, ii, 282, 290–292, 295, 428.
Ballads, as dramatic material, or connected with plays, i, 254, 283, 284, 320, 337, 348, 388; ii, 397.
Ballmann, O., i, 198.
"Balusters," i, 159.
*Band, Cuff, and Ruff*, i, 522; ii, 84.
Bandello, M., i, 203, 334, 374, 401, 544, 585; ii, 193, 211, 218, 224, 448.
Bang, W., i, 62, 281; ii, 135.
Bankside, the theaters of the, i, 496.
Bapst, G. P., i, 50.
*Baptistes*, i, 34, 44.
Barclay, Alexander, i, xxxiii, 492.
Barkstead, William, i, 585; ii, 376.
*Barnavelt*, i, 440, 441, 551, 552, 603; ii, 419.
Barnes, Barnabe, i, 390, 410, 465; ii, 262, 331, 496.
Baron, Robert, i, 451.
Barrey, Lodowick, i, 518.
"Barriers," the, ii, 94.
*Barriers, Speeches at Prince Henry's*, ii, 94, 111.
*Bartholomew Fair*, i, 156, 496, 530, 532; ii, 240, 309, 415.
*Bashful Lover*, ii, 233.
Bassano, F. Nigrida, i, 60.
Baston, Robert, i, 37.
Bath, Shakespeare's company in, i, 493.
Bathurst, Edward, ii, 338.
*Battle of Alcazar*, i, 227, 228, 428; ii, 456, 495.
Baudissin, W. H. T., i, 478.
Bayne, R., i, 345.
Bajazet II, i, 447, 449.
*Bear a Brain*, i, 279, 280, 504.
Bear Garden, the, i, 156, 496.
Beard, Thomas, i, 237; ii, 62.
Beatty, A., i, 254.
Beaumont, Francis, i, xxiv, xxx, xxxvii, 202, 207, 306, 315, 432, 497, 523–527, 586, 595–597, 600–602; ii, 37, 38, 204, 250, 413, 418; indebtedness to Cervantes, i, 206; and the comedy of manners, 351, 525; in romantic comedy, 400–402, 404; chronology of earlier plays of, 401; details of the life of, 523–525; share of, in *Maid's Tragedy*, 596; character of Philaster credited to, 597; and the masque, ii, 104, 116–118, 127; relations to Fletcher and other dramatists, 184, 185, 190, 268; characteristics of his work and record, 185–190, 193–197, 216, 220, 376, 381–383; indebtedness of, to Shakespeare, 415, 417. See, also, *Beaumont and Fletcher*, and the several plays.
Beaumont and Fletcher, folio of, i, 525, 601; incorrect attribution of plays to, 525; chronology of the works of, 525; influence of, 600, 601; and the masque, ii, 128; collaboration of, 183–189; tests of several authorship, 186–189; variorum edition of, 194; use of Spanish sources, 205–216; Shakespearean

reminiscence in, 220; first folio of, 243; method of dramatic contrast introduced by, 351; contrasted with Shakespeare, 417; their contribution to romantic drama, 417; technique of, 418; bibliography of, 462, 503–505, 526, 527, 530, 531.
Beaumont, Sir John, i, 524.
Beaumont, Joseph, i, 524; ii, 83.
*Beauties*, ii, 315.
*Beauty, Masque of*, ii, 108.
*Beauty and Housewifery*, i, 386.
*Beauty in a Trance*, ii, 328.
Beeston, Christopher, ii, 311.
*Beggar's Bush*, ii, 205, 206, 219, 220.
Belchier, Danbridgcourt, ii, 256, 257.
*Believe as You List*, i, 603; ii, 37, 234, 308, 312, 423, 424, 430–432, 453, 495, 531, 532.
*Belin Dun*, i, 252, 261.
Belisarius, ii, 45.
Bell Savage theater, the, i, xxxiv, 144, 147, 153, 154.
Bellan, Sieur de, ii, 211.
Belleforest, F. de, i, 374, 560, 585.
*Bellman of London*, i, 499; ii, 241, 242.
*Bellman of Paris*, i, 423.
*Bellum Grammaticale*, ii, 63, 64.
Belphegor, the story of, i, 356, 357; ii, 486.
Benger, Thomas, i, 102.
Bereblock, John, i, 107–108; ii, 58, 72.
Berkeley, Sir Thomas, ii, 8.
Berkeley, Sir William, ii, 367, 368.
*Bernardo and Fiametta*, i, 379.
*Bestrafte Brudermord*, i, 216, 217, 554; ii, 464.
*Better Late than Never*, i, 279, 280, 504.
Beza, T., i, 39; ii, 446.
Biblical plays and sources, i, 6, 10, 15–19, 22, 27–35, 37–44, 55, 77, 91, 454; ii, 394, 446.
*Bibliotheca Heberiana*, i, 252.
Biographical themes in the early drama, i, 285–291; ii, 402.
*Bird in a Cage*, ii, 313–315.
Birkhead, Henry, i, 306.
Biron, Charles, Duke de, i, 416, 417, 420; and see *Byron, Conspiracy of*, etc.
*Birth of Hercules*, i, 458; ii, 53, 518.
*Birth of Merlin*, i, 295, 296, 386, 433, 510; ii, 480, 481, 495.
*Black Batman of the North*, i, 345, 349.
*Black Dog of Newgate*, i, 360, 499, 521.
Blackfriars, the theater in, i, xxxv, xxxviii, 123, 146, 147, 154, 160, 172, 173, 312, 427, 472, 489, 496, 497; ii, 36, 242, 243, 302, 311, 329, 369, 391.
*Blackness, Masque of*, ii, 104, 112.
*Blacksmith's Daughter*, i, 291; ii, 404.
Blagrave, Thomas, i, 102.
Blakiston, H. E. D., i, 68.
*Blessed Sacrament, Play of the*, i, 31.
*Blind Beggar of Alexandria*, i, 460, 464, 465; ii, 271, 409.
*Blind Beggar of Bednal Green*, i, 281, 284, 397; ii, 479.
*Bloody Banquet*, i, 594; ii, 261.
*Bloody Brother*, i, 425–427, 603; ii, 341, 495.
*Blurt, Master Constable*, i, 380, 381, 402, 511, 522, 523; ii, 493.
Boadicea, i, 253, 302.
Boar's Head Tavern, i, 499.
Boas, F. S., i, 211–214, 216, 224, 225, 235, 236, 418, 424, 428, 555; ii, 375.
Boase, C. W., ii, 53.
Bobadil, 462.
Boccaccio, i, 196, 197, 301, 401, 456, 537, 544; ii, 139, 193, 301, 503.
Böddeker, K., i, 48.
Bohemia, Queen of. See *Elizabeth Stuart, Princess*.
Boleyn, Anne, i, 95.
Bolte, J., i, 36, 64; ii, 81.
Bonarelli della Rovere, G. U., Count, ii, 178.
Bond, R. W., i, 101, 109, 113, 121, 123–126, 131, 200; ii, 63, 145, 146, 147, 149, 150, 151, 378.
*Bondman*, ii, 38, 39, 230, 232.
*Bonduca*, i, 253, 302, 303, 601; ii, 38, 417.
*Boss of Billingsgate*, i, 499.
Bower, Richard, i, 72, 112, 120; ii, 16.
Boy-actors, i, 112–119, 146, 147, 186, 495; ii, 369, 454. See, also, *Children of the Chapel*, and *of Paul's*.
Boy Bishop, the, i, 47, 54, 73, 111; ii, 447.
Boyle, R., i, 206, 384, 598; ii, 253.
Brachiano, Paulo Giordano Ursini, Duke of, i, 588, 589.
Brackyn, Francis, ii, 66.
Bradley, A. C., i, 561, 576, 581.
Brae, A. E., i, 372.
Braggart, the, as a type, i, 311, 361, 369, 382, 462, 463, 467.
Brandl, Alois, i, 38, 54–57, etc., *passim*.

Brandon, Samuel, i, 573, 574; ii, 6–8.
Brandt, Sebastian, i, xxxiii.
*Branhowlte*, i, 423.
*Brazen Age*, i, 176; ii, 19, 20, 513.
*Brennoralt*, i, 422, 423; ii, 362–364.
Brereton, J. Le G., i, 205.
*Bretbie, Masque at*, ii, 134, 282.
Breton, Nicholas, i, 522; ii, 147.
Brewer, Anthony, i, 284; ii, 303.
Breymann, H., i, 231.
*Bride*, ii, 280, 281.
Bridgewater, Earl of, ii, 133.
Bright, M., ii, 158.
Bristol, i, 493.
*Bristow Merchant*, i, 349.
Bristowe, Francis, i, 44, 60.
*Britannia Triumphans*, i, 198; ii, 135.
British legends as dramatic material, i, 295–307.
Brodmeier, Cecil, i, 163, 166, 170, 171.
*Broken Heart*, ii, 37, 312, 328–333, 335, 535.
Brome, Alexander, ii, 366.
Brome, Richard, i, 363, 503; ii, 247, 261–263, 366, 377, 381, 385; a servant of Jonson's, ii, 269; instructed by Jonson and Dekker, 269, 381; comedies of, 269–275; tragicomedies of, 336–338; a follower of Fletcher and Jonson, 337, 425, 426, 428; contemporary status of, 425; bibliography of, 533, 535.
Brooke, Arthur, i, 208, 570; ii, 92.
Brooke, Christopher, ii, 163.
Brooke, Lord. See Greville, Fulke.
Brooke, Samuel, ii, 80, 163, 519.
Brotanek, R., i, 74, 76; ii, 95, 135, 136.
*Brothers*, i, 293; ii, 288.
Browne, William, ii, 120, 121, 126, 139, 164, 374, 418, 522.
Browne, W. H., i, 534.
Browning, Robert, i, xlii, 420; ii, 14.
Brunhild, Queen, i, 423.
Bruno, Giordano, i, 540–542; ii, 4, 500.
Brute, i, 253.
*Brute Greenshield*, i, 298.
Brydges, Dr., i, 86, 87.
Buc, Sir George, i, 416, 424, 441, 498; ii, 243, 245, 453.
Buchanan, George, i, 33–37, 39, 40, 44, 83, 88, 91; ii, 2, 55, 401, 446.
Buckingham, George Villiers, first Duke of, i, 252, 443; ii, 124.
*Buckingham*, i, 253, 261, 281.
Buffeting, the, i, 46.
*Bugbears*, i, 196.
Bull theater, the, i, xxxiv, 143, 153, 297, 311.
Bullen, A. H., editor, cited *passim*, i, 61, 114, 132, 135, 178, 199, 202, etc.
Bunyan, John, i, 54.
Burbage, Cuthbert, i, 183.
Burbage, James, i, 154, 496.
Burbage, Richard, i, xxvi, 146, 155, 182, 183, 185, 188, 312, 313, 315, 317, 318, 332, 347, 348, 366, 490, 496–498; ii, 38, 67, 122, 242, 243, 378, 380, 418, 458.
*Burbon*, i, 413
Burleigh, William Cecil, Lord, i, 102, 123, 124, 289.
Burn, J. H., i, 154.
Burnell, Henry, i, 442.
*Burning of John Huss*, i, 72, 406.
*Burning of Sodom*, i, 35.
Burton, Robert, ii, 74, 75, 329.
*Bussy D'Ambois*, i, 400, 414–416, 418–420, 563, 579, 580; ii, 407, 494, 495.
Butler, P., i, 6.
Byron, George Gordon Noel, Lord, i, xl.
*Byron, Conspiracy of Charles, Duke of*, i, 415–417, 420, 421, 440, 452, 551; ii, 414, 419, 495.
*Byrsa Basilica*, i, 285; ii, 59, 402.

*Cælia*, i, 465.
Cæsar, Julius, i, 253, 303; plays on, 550, ii, 21–24, 27, 92; and see *Julius Cæsar*.
*Cæsar and Pompey*, (several of this title), ii, 21, 22, 28; (of Chapman), 22, 28, 514.
*Cæsar's Fall*, i, 509, 587.
*Cæsar's Revenge*. See *Cæsar and Pompey*.
Calderon, Pedro, i, xliii; ii, 249.
Calfhill, James, ii, 57.
Caliban, ii, 203.
*Calisto and Melibœa*, i, 88–92, 197, 198, 386, 595; ii, 205.
Calvinistic theology in *Cymbeline*, ii, 199.
*Cambises*, i, 72, 120, 121, 199; ii, 16.
Cambridge, i, 336, 374, 397, 465, 489; ii, 53, 54, 56, 57, 75, 518; and see *College drama*.
Camden, William, i, 99, 465, 508; ii, 452.
*Campaspe*, i, 123, 124, 127, 128, 130, 132, 240; ii, 16, 18, 339; 456.

Campbell, K., ii, 341.
Campion, Edmund, ii, 57.
Campion, Thomas, ii, 99, 103, 104, 107, 115, 118; ii, 374, 411, 418, 521, 522.
*Candelaio*, i, 540, 541.
Capello, Bianca, i, 409, 586, 587, 589; ii, 312.
*Captain*, i, 528; ii, 184, 205.
*Captain Underwit*. See *Country Captain*.
*Captives, or the Lost Recovered*, i, 352; ii, 236, 262, 309, 457, 485.
*Captivi*, i, 457; ii, 88.
Caracalla, i, 426; ii, 28.
Caractacus, i, 253, 302, 303.
*Cardenio*, ii, 190, 206, 207, 212, 213, 527.
*Cardinal*, ii, 312, 313, 321, 324–326, 428.
Cards used as dramatic material, i, 138, 445.
*Careless Shepherdess*, i, 449; ii, 169, 170, 174.
Carew, Lady Elizabeth, i, 42; ii, 8, 512.
Carew, Thomas, ii, 132, 133, 269, 361, 374, 522.
Carlell, Lodowick, i, 303, 449, 602; ii, 336, 352–358, 385; the spelling of the name, 352; his preferment at court, 353; tragicomedies of, 353–356; degeneracy in his plays derived from Fletcher, 356; the verse prose of, 356, 357; romances of, intermediary between Fletcher and heroic romance, 426–428; bibliography of, 496, 537.
Carlisle, Lucy Hay, Countess of, ii, 346.
Carlton, Sir Dudley, ii, 121.
Carlyle, Thomas, ii, 351.
Carnarvon, Robert Dormer, Earl of, i, 231.
Cartwright, George, ii, 365.
Cartwright, R., i, 485.
Cartwright, William, i, 172, 425, 449; ii, 46, 47, 89–91, 219, 269, 275–277, 336, 361, 381, 533.
Carver, J. L., i, 306.
*Casamiento Engañoso*, ii, 248.
*Case is Altered*, i, 176, 380, 409, 457, 465, 477, 488, 489, 500, 539; ii, 493.
*Casina*, i, 538.
Castiglione, Baldassare, i, 93; ii, 143.
*Castigo del Pensquée*, ii, 315.
*Castle of Perseverance*, i, 54–56, 156; ii, 394, 449.
Castrioto, George. See *Scanderbeg*.
Castro, Guillen de, i, 402; ii, 214.
*Catilina Triumphans*, ii, 32.
Catiline, plays on, ii, 27, 32.
*Catiline, his Conspiracy*, i, xxxiii, 469, 524, 577; ii, 26, 32–34, 50, 414, 516.
Catizzone, Marco Tullio, i, 431.
Cawarden, Sir Thomas, i, 76, 100–102.
*Cawsome-House, Entertainment at*, ii, 118.
Caxton, William, i, 199.
Cayet, Pierre Victor, i, 418.
Cecil (first name unknown), ii, 81.
*Celant, Disordered Life of the Countess of*, i, 585.
*Celestina*, i, 89, 386; ii, 451.
Celtic legend. See *British legends*.
Cenci, the, i, 604.
Censorship of plays, i, 498.
Cervantes, Miguel de, i, 206, 217, 520, 599; ii, 205–208, 213, 215, 217, 231, 236, 248, 260, 530.
Cespedes, Gonzalo de, ii, 210, 215.
*Chabot, Admiral of France*, i, 415, 420, 421, 452, 453, 551; ii, 224, 292, 316, 317.
*Challenge at Tilt*, ii, 118.
*Challenge for Beauty*, i, 338; ii, 225, 309, 425, 532.
Chamberlain, John, ii, 121.
Chamberlain, Robert, ii, 303.
Chamberlain's players, i, 145, 169, 313, 383, 460, 466, 472, 481, 489, 494; ii, 379. See, also, *Shakespeare's company*.
Chambers, E. K., i, 2–142; ii, 53, 96, etc., *passim*.
*Chance Medley*, i, 504.
*Chances*, ii, 206–208, 215.
*Changeling*, i, 510, 583, 595, 596, 599, 600; ii, 419, 510.
*Changes*, ii, 290.
Chapel children. See *Children of the Chapel*.
Chapman, George, i, xxv, 407, 418, 423, 424, 452, 453, 504, 509, 537, 563, 566, 579, 598; ii, 11, 22, 23, 25, 28, 77, 271, 381, 382, 388, 389, 392; one of the school of conscious effort, i, xxxv; *Eastward Hoe*, i, 169, 229; and Marlowe, 225; *Alphonsus of Germany* attributed to, 228; *Comedy of Umers* ascribed to, 322; the work of, 351, 352; dramatic career of, 398; in romantic comedy, 398–400, 404; his plays on

contemporary French history, 407, 413–421; his studies in dramatic portraiture, 413, 414; his life and work, 414–417; his translations and respect for the ancients, 414; his difficulties about the plays on Byron, 417; sources of the historical plays of, 417; his opinions as to the nature of "authentical tragedy," 418, 419; in historical drama, 419, 420; his gnomic poetry, 420; and Browning, 420; not the author of *Alphonsus of Germany*, 438; not the author of *Revenge for Honor*, 448; and the comedy of manners, i, 456, 459–464; compared with Shakespeare, 459; led naturally to use of Italian and classical sources, 459; anticipated Jonson in use of the word "humor" and "humorous" types, 460; excellence of *All Fools*, 461; laid scene of two comedies in France, 464; comedies of, characterized, 464; and the "war of theaters," i, 473, 484; his collaboration in *Eastward Hoe*, 505, 506; imprisoned for the satire of that play, 507; his gnomic moralizing, ii, 3; and the masque, 104; his *Masque of the Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn*, 115, 116; cost of this masque, 119; his classical learning in the masque, 126; collaborator with Jonson, 268; and *The Ball*, 291, 292; and *Chabot*, 293; a gentleman born, 376; leaves the Admiral's men, 379; esteemed by Jonson, 381; praised for his "haightned style" by Webster, 382; the tempered romanticism of, 388; the Plautine intrigue of the comedies of, 400; Plautus filtered through Italian playwrights in the comedies of, 401; preposterous disguises in *The Blind Beggar of Alexandria* of, 409; recurrence of, to Plautine intrigue in *All Fools* and subsequent comedies, 410; his contribution to the tragedy of revenge, 413; plays of, on modern French history, 414; political allusions in the dramas of, 414; his romantic comedies influenced by Shakespeare, 415; a writer of masques, 418; mutilation, by the censor, of plays of, 419; bibliography of, 494, 495, 497, 514.

Character, the Jew as a, i, 232, 233; Lodge's drawing of, 242; Marlowe's drawing of, 268; Shakespeare's drawing of, 274–276; methods of drawing of, contrasted, 302, 303; in Chapman, 463; Jonson's portrayal of, 467; relation of, to incident in comedy, 468, 469; in the comedy of manners, 503, 504, 545; in Middleton, 512–515; in Beaumont and Fletcher, ii, 195, 197; in Fletcher, 250.

*Charlemagne*, i, 202, 203; ii, 35, 399, 462.

Charles I, i, xxiii, xxxii, 43, 44, 115, 342, 355, 443–445; ii, 10, 83, 94, 104, 112, 124, 127, 128, 130, 131, 135, 163, 164, 285, 292, 295, 300, 301, 310, 311, 345–352, 385; his company of players, 242, 245, 310, 329, 386; and see *Revels*.

Charles II, ii, 310, 342, 386.

Charles V of Germany, i, 453.

Charles VII of France, ii, 255.

Charles, Prince Palatine, ii, 135.

Charteris, R., i, 70.

Chase, L. N., ii, 350, 351.

*Chaste Maid in Cheapside*, i, 499, 513, 547, 595; ii, 276.

Chaucer, Geoffrey, i, xxiii, 35, 58, 80, 113, 198, 329, 385, 392; ii, 155, 198, 462, 488, 491.

Cheke, Henry, i, 60, 81; ii, 55.

*Chester Plays*, i, 10, 17, 19, 23, 406; ii, 19, 444, 445.

*Chester Tragedy*, i, 509.

Chettle, Henry, i, 42, 253, 271, 408, 431, 436, 452, 521, 587; ii, 32, 153, 154; the plays of, 279–283, 305, 329, 345, 346, 349, 385; influence of, on Davenport, 304, 305; satirized Daniel, 478; his many lost plays, 562; his *Hoffman*, its place among tragedies of revenge, 562, 563; his publication of Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit*, 563; his apology to Shakespeare in *Kind-Heart's Dream*, 563; ii, 473; his popular mythological plays, 20, 21; his recognition of Shakespeare, 379; leaves the Admiral's men, 379; his *Hoffman*, a following of earlier tragedies of revenge, 411; bibliography of, 479, 507.

*Chief Promises of God unto Man*, i, 32, 33, 59.

Child, C. G., i, 127, 350, 541.

Child, F. J., i, 83, 337; ii, 155.

Children of the Chapel, i, 111, 112, 114–117, 120, 123, 138, 146, 147, 154, 167,

172, 186, 198, 255, 313, 473, 482, 484, 488, 495, 496, 519; ii, 377, 454.
Children of Paul's, i, 473, 489; ii, 190.
Children of the Revels, ii, 190.
*Chinon of England*, i, 202; ii, 359.
*Chloridia*, ii, 130.
Chorus used by Jonson, i, 469.
Christ, K., i, 515.
*Christ Triumphant*, i, 39.
*Christ's Passion*, i, 44; ii, 394.
*Christ's Victory*, ii, 164.
*Christianetta*, ii, 269.
"Christian Terence," ii, 1.
*Christian turned Turk*, i, 292; ii, 241, 480.
*Christmas, Masque of*, ii, 120, 122, 127.
*Christmas Comes but Once a Year*, i, 504.
Christmas Lord. See *Misrule, Lord of*.
Christmas play, the, i, 2, 5, 7; and see *Pastores*.
Christmas Prince, the, at Oxford, ii, 73; at Gray's Inn, 73.
"Christmasing," ii, 98.
Christopherson, John, i, 37; ii, 54, 446.
*Christus Nascens*, i, 37.
*Christus Patiens*, i, 44.
*Christus Redivivus*, i, 36; ii, 54.
*Christus Triumphans*, i, 39.
Chronicle play, i, xxviii, xxix, 42, 71, 114, 193, 194, 233, 234, 242, 486; pre-eminence of Shakespeare in, i, 248, 253, 254; definition of, 251; range of subject, 251–254; forerunners of, 254–256; the earliest, 257; comedy in, 257; before Shakespeare, 261–265, 267; influence of Marlowe upon, 268, 269; of Shakespeare, 272–279; on pseudo-historical themes, 284, 285, 293–296, 298–301; on biographical themes, 285–291; the Tudor group, 287–291; journalism in the, 288, 289, 292; allegory in the, 289; of travel and adventure, 291–293; on legendary and mythical themes, 293–303; glorification of, by Shakespeare, 298–301; on English themes, 298, 305, 306; absorbed into the romantic drama, 301–304; advance represented on older drama, 302, 303; attempts to revive the older form, 304; as literature, 307, 308; Shakespeare and the, 368, 369; in relation to romantic comedy, 396; of Heywood, 397; local color in, 499; presaged in earlier decades of Elizabeth's reign, ii, 403; extension of, to foreign subjects, 405; height of, 406, 407; rivalry of Shakespeare and Marlowe in, 406; bibliography of, 470–472, 477–481.
Chronicles, the, as sources of dramatic material, i, 300, 454.
Chronology of the Elizabethan drama, i, xxiv, xxv.
Churchill, G. B., i, 265, 267, 398.
Churchyard, Thomas, ii, 83, 98, 403.
Cicero, i, 539; ii, 33.
*Cicilia and Clorinda*, ii, 357.
Cinthio, G., i, 210, 230, 331, 382, 575; ii, 324.
*Cintia*, ii, 77.
City, dispute between actors and, i, 312.
*City Madam*, ii, 246, 252–254, 423, 533.
*City Match*, ii, 277.
*City Nightcap*, i, 599; ii, 259.
*City Wit*, ii, 270, 271, 425.
Civil wars in France, plays on, i, 412, 551.
*Civil Wars in France*, i, 412, 551.
*Civitatis Amor*, i, 510; ii, 128.
*Claracilla*, ii, 356.
Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, ii, 43.
Clark, A., ii, 340.
Clark, W. G., i, 299.
Classical influences and sources, i, xxxi, xxxii, 63, 240, 309, 414, 454, 467, 469, 538, 539; ii, 1–50, 125, 400–402, 485, 511–517.
Classification, its dangers and desirability, i, 552.
*Cleander*, ii, 234.
Clemons, W. H., ii, 92.
*Cleodora*. See *Queen of Aragon*.
Cleopatra, plays on, ii, 44.
Cleopatra (Shakespeare's), i, 573, 574.
*Cleopatra* (of May), i, 572; ii, 44; (of Daniel), ii, 7, 402, 411.
*Clerico et Puella, De*, i, 49, 50.
*Cléopâtre Captive*, ii, 6.
Clinton, Lord, his players, i, 144.
*Clitophon*, ii, 75.
Cloetta, W., i, 9.
*Cloridon and Radiamanta*, i, 199.
*Clorys and Orgasto*, i, 379.
Clough, A. H., i, 353.
*Club Law*, ii, 64.
*Cobbler's Prophesy*, i, 68, 189.
Cock, John, i, 519.

Cockayne, Sir Aston, ii, 134, 228, 231, 275, 281, 282, 384, 533.
Cockpit theater, i, xxxiv, 160, 242, 285, 298; ii, 311, 354, 360, 384, 385, 427.
Coddington, Robert, ii, 78.
*Cælo and Olympo*, ii, 20.
*Cælum Britannicum*, ii, 132, 133.
Cohn, A., i, 144, 186, 232, 285; ii, 391.
*Cola's Fury*, i, 306.
*Coleorton, Masque of*, ii, 103, 121.
Colet, John, i, 85.
Coligny, Admiral Gaspard de, i, 453.
*Colin Clout Come Home Again*, ii, 76.
*Coliphizacio*, or *Buffeting*, i, 18.
Collaboration, i, 265–267, 505, 506.
College drama, i, 66, 85, 239, 459; ii, 51–92; pre-Elizabethan, 53, 54; employed to entertain Queen Elizabeth, 56–58; its popularity, 58, 59; census of, 59; included biblical and classical myths even in the reign of James, 75; Roman historical subjects in, 75, 76; Italian sources in, 77, 78; pastoral influences on, 79, 80; satire and allegory in, 81, 82; political application of, 89; amateurish character of, 90, 91, bibliography of, 449, 517–520.
Collier, J. P., i, 32, 55, 59, etc., *passim;* forgeries of, i, 411, 430; ii, 375.
*Collier, History of the*, i, 119.
*Collier of Croydon.* See *Grim.*
Collins, J. C., i, 200, 227, 243, 244, 260, 428, 564; ii, 400.
*Cologne Martyrology*, ii, 40.
*Colonel.* See *Siege.*
*Columbus*, i, 430.
Colwell, Thomas, i, 86.
*Combat of Love and Friendship*, ii, 84, 345.
*Come See a Wonder*, ii, 235.
*Comedias de capa y espada*, ii, 216.
Comedy, a permanent element in drama, i, xxviii; in the sacred drama, xxviii, 12, 41, 45–47; influence of the Roman, 63, 240; in the early drama, 86, 87, 91; ii, 449; influence of Gascoigne's *Supposes* on the, i, 104, 105; Lyly's use of, 133, 240; composite character of earlier, 240; in chronicle plays, 257, 274–276; of disguise, 279, 283; in the miracles and early plays, 309–311; elements of, satire led to birth of drama, 309; in earlier plays, 309, 311; prepared for the later domestic drama, 312; playwrights with Henslowe excelled in, of everyday life, 318; of London life, 319, 327; of intrigue, 333, 380; romantic, 351, 352; satirical, 351, 352; the *Monsieur D'Olive*, a notable example of, 399; of humors, 454–476; ii, 497–502; the basis of, i, 467, 468; in Shakespeare, and Jonson, 468–471; Jonson's classical theories concerning, 469, 470; of disguise, ii, 409. See, also, below.
*Comedy of Beauty and Housewifery*, i, 386.
*Comedy of Errors*, i, xxxv, xxxvi, 119, 193, 323, 370, 371, 378, 458, 459, 468; ii, 99, 400, 407.
*Comedy of Humers*, i, 460.
Comedy of London life, i, 319, 327, 493, 499, 500; early, 500, 501; Dekker and Webster in, 502, 503; *Eastward Hoe*, a typical, 504–508; Middleton and, 511–518; imitators of Middleton in, 518–522; Fletcher in, 526–528; Jonson and, 529–532; bibliography of, ii, 502–505.
Comedy of manners, its nature and varieties, i, 455, 456, 492; Latin and Italian elements in, 456–458 (see, also, ch. x, *passim*); relation of the *Comedy of Errors* to, 458, 459; Chapman and, 459–464; Jonson and, 460, 465–472; the single dynamic personality as a structural element in, 462; Percy and the, 464; epoch-making character of *Every Man in His Humor*, 467; Jonson's conception of "humors" in its relation to, 470–472; satire in earlier drama, 473–476; the "war of the theaters," 476–491; Jonson and Middleton contrasted in, 492, 515; local color in, 498; London life in, 500–522; in romantic plays, 522, 523; Fletcher and, 525, 526; Jonson in, 529–542; English fiber of, 529, 530; development in the, 532, 533; life as viewed in, 535; ingenuity of plot in, 536; the "demonstrator" of the action in, 536; sources and use of material in, 536–542; Marston in, 542–545; types of character in, 546, 547; wide vogue and popularity of, 547; contrasted realistic and satirical types of, ii, 240; later, 240–305; influence of Jonson and Middleton on, 240, 241; of the elder dramatists, 244–246; English and foreign setting in the, 246, 247; of

Fletcher, 247–252; of Massinger, 252–256; of May and Davenport, 257–261; minor, non-extant, 261, 262; of Heywood and William Rowley, 262, 263; of Jonson, 264–267; of Brome, 269–275; of Marmion, Cartwright, Mayne, 275–278; of Glapthorne, Nabbes, and Cockayne, 279–282; of the Duke of Newcastle, 282–284; of James Shirley, 284–297; of Ford, 297–299; of Davenant, 299–302; of Thomas Killigrew, 302; of other minor playwrights, 302–304; bibliography of, 502–505, 532–534. See, also, *Romantic Comedy*.

*Comical Gallant*, i, 278.

Commedia dell' arte, i, 196.

*Commedy Achademios*, i, 68.

*Common Conditions*, i, 199; ii, 348, 359, 402, 462.

*Comodey of Umers*, i, 322.

Companies, the, i, xxvi, 141–148, 181–184, 266, 312–314, 317, 318, 365, 366, 493–498; ii, 241–243, 310, 311, 454, 460, 461; and see under individual companies named.

"Comparative literature," ii, 5.

*Complaint of the Satyrs*, ii, 146.

*Comus*, i, 201; ii, 95, 120, 133, 134, 158, 523.

*Conan of Cornwall*, i, 298.

*Conceited Duke*, ii, 314.

*Conceited Pedlar*, ii, 86.

Condell, Henry, i, 182, 183, 384; ii, 243, 380, 458.

Congreve, William, i, xxxiii, xlii.

Conqueror plays, i, 552; ii, 190, 191, 406, 407.

*Conquest of Brute*, i, 298.

*Conquest of Granada*, ii, 349.

*Conquest of Spain by John of Gaunt*, i, 252, 429.

*Conquest of the West Indies*, i, 429; ii, 212.

*Conspiracy*. See *Palantius and Eudora*.

*Conspiracy of Charles, Duke of Byron*. See *Byron, Conspiracy of*, etc.

*Constant Maid*, ii, 279, 294, 295.

*Constantine*, i, 203.

Contemporary life and events as dramatic material, i, xxix; 309–366, *passim*; 372, 375, 376, 379, 407, 409, 418, 419, 421, 441, 443–445, 551; ii, 414, 418, 419.

*Contention of Ajax and Ulysses*, ii, 138.

*Contentions of York and Lancaster*, i, 261, 264, 265, 267; ii, 471.

*Conversations of Jonson with Drummond*. See *Drummond*.

*Conversion of St. Paul*, i, 12, 30.

*Converted Robber*, ii, 170.

Cooke, Joshua, i, 331.

Corbet, Richard, Bishop of Oxford, ii, 79.

*Coriolanus*, ii, 29, 30, 515.

Corneille, Pierre, i, 427, 577, 601; ii, 26, 29, 30, 312, 414.

*Cornelia*, ii, 2, 6, 8, 368, 465, 512.

*Cornelianum Dolium*, ii, 85.

*Cornelie*, ii, 6.

Cornish, William, i, 76, 198.

Cornish cycle of miracle plays, the, i, 21; ii, 445.

Corombona, Vittoria, i, 585, 588.

*Corona Minervæ*, ii, 135.

*Coronation*, ii, 43, 317, 321, 322, 336, 428.

*Corporal*, i, 427; ii, 338.

Corpus Christi, Institution of the Feast of, 14; the Festival at York, 15; at Chester, 19; plays acted by craft-guilds, i, 20, 22–25; expense of the plays of, 25; effect of Protestantism on the plays of, 25, 26.

*Cosmo de' Medici*, i, 408.

*Costly Whore*, i, 439; ii, 496.

Costume in the masque, ii, 106.

Cotton, Sir Robert, i, 19.

*Countess of Celant*, i, 585.

*Country Captain*, ii, 283, 284, 534.

*Country Girl*, ii, 303, 304.

*Country Tragedy in Vacuniam*, i, 465.

Couplet, use of the, in the heroic play, ii, 349, 351, 427.

*Courage of Love*. See *Love and Honor*.

*Courageous Turk*, i, 449; ii, 81.

*Coursing of the Hare*, ii, 36.

Court, plays at, i, 245, 256, 265, 378, 394, 401.

*Court Beggar*, ii, 273, 276.

Court plays, i, 93–140; close relation of school and, 94, 95; staging and setting of, 107–110; classification of, 118, 119; Italian influence on the, 119; of Inns of Court, 121; allusiveness of, 124, 127–131; allegory in, 128–131; the literary coterie in relation to, 128, 129; Lyly's part in, 133, 134; and the popular drama, 186, 187; defects of, 367; Shakespeare's indebtedness

to, 369, 370, 391; bibliography of, ii, 454, 455.
*Court Secret*, ii, 313, 318.
Courthope, W. J., i, 369.
Cousin, V., ii, 346.
*Covent Garden*, ii, 280.
Coventry, i, 490.
*Coventry Plays*, i, 20–22, 26; ii, 444, 445.
Cowley, Abraham, ii, 87, 88, 176, 179, 304, 401.
Cowley, Richard, i, 188.
*Cox of Collumpton*, i, 345.
*Coxcomb*, i, 401, 402, 599; ii, 206.
*Crafty Merchant*, ii, 262.
Crashaw, Richard, i, 44; ii, 328, 330.
Crawford, C., i, 343, 344, 592.
*Creation of Eve*, i, 22.
Creed, abolition of the guild of the, i, 26; plays of the, i, 26.
Creizenach, W., i, 2, 7, 50, 51, 53, 54, 57, 88, 217; ii, 392.
*Cripple of Fenchurch Street*, i, 499; and see *Fair Maid of the Exchange*.
*Crœsus*, ii, 14.
Croft, H. H. S., i, 82.
Croll, M. W., ii, 7, 11.
Cromwell, Oliver, ii, 71, 72.
Cromwell, Thomas, Earl of Essex, i, 32, 59, 85, 499.
*Cromwell, History of Thomas, Lord*, i, 261, 285–287; ii, 479.
Crown, the burning, i, 563.
*Cruel Brother*, ii, 341, 425.
*Cruell Detter*, i, 208, 209.
*Cruelty of a Stepmother*, i, 118, 343.
Cruso, Aquila, ii, 75.
*Cuckqueans' and Cuckcolds' Errants*, i, 334, 464, 465.
Cumber, John, i, 439.
Cunliffe, J. W., i, 97, 107, 209, 215, 425, 556; ii, 6, 96.
*Cunning Lovers*, ii, 366.
Cunningham, F., i, 117, 173, 326, 357.
Cunningham, P., i, 146.
*Cupid and Death*, ii, 136.
*Cupid's Banishment*, ii, 121.
*Cupid's Revenge*, i, 601; ii, 179, 193, 365, 601.
*Cupid's Whirligig*, i, 518.
*Cure for a Cuckold*, i, 350, 433, 544; ii, 236, 244, 510.
*Curioso Impertinente*, i, 520, 599; ii, 206, 260, 505, 511, 530.
*Cursor Mundi*, i, 18.
Curtain. See *Traverse*.
Curtain theater, the, i, 144–146, 149, 153–155, 159, 160, 313; ii, 242, 375.
Cushman, L. W., i, 25, 53, 54.
*Custom of the Country*, ii, 208.
*Cutlack*, i, 294.
*Cutter of Coleman Street*, ii, 88.
*Cutwell*, i, 118.
*Cymbeline*, i, 301–303, 595; ii, 29, 32, 129, 199, 200, 414, 480, 516, 528, 529.
*Cymon*, ii, 47, 249.
*Cynocephali, History of*, i, 118.
*Cynthia's Revels*, i, 172, 173, 468, 473, 481, 482, 488, 529, 536; ii, 68, 105, 410.
*Cynthia's Revenge or Mœnander's Extasy*, ii, 14.
*Cyrus*. See *Wars of Cyrus*.

Daborne, Robert, i, 292, 316, 409, 528; ii, 38, 161–163, 228, 229, 211, 242, 480, 527, 533.
*Dalida*, ii, 76.
*Dame Siriz*, i, 49.
*Damoiselle*, ii, 273.
*Damon and Pithias*, i, 98, 113, 120, 121, 310; ii, 21.
*Daniel*, i, 8, 9.
Daniel, John, his attempt to establish a provincial theater, ii, 242, 243; his license to act refused at Exeter, 243.
Daniel, P. A., ii, 70.
Daniel, Samuel, i, xxx, xxxii, 250, 577; ii, 6, 49, 76, 91, 113, 126, 242, 340, 375; in the court drama, i, 133, 134; his obligations to Lyly, 140; in pastoral, 400; satirized by Jonson, 478, 481, 482; and by Dekker and Chettle, 478; standing of, in 1598, 478; his success in the classical mode, 574; his life and works, ii, 7–11; his *Delia*, 9, 112; intimacy of, with Greville, 11; introduces the pastoral drama in the universities, 80; his *Panegyric* of James, 101; his *Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, 102–104; his rivalry of Jonson, 110; his post as groom of the Privy Chamber, 110; his *Tethys' Festival*, 111–112; and the *Maid's Metamorphosis*, 151, 152; his *Queen's Arcadia*, 156, 158; his *Hymen's Triumph*, 163, 164, 169, 174, 175, 179; Jonson's contempt for, 381, 410; wholly of the academic school, 388;

his Senecan tragedies, 402, 411; ridiculed in the war of the theaters, 410; minor part of, in the development of the masque, 411; leadership of, in the pastoral drama, 412; bibliography of, 512, 521, 525.
*Danse macabre*, i, 51.
Dansiker, the pirate, i, 292.
Danter, John, i, 220.
Darby, the Countess of, ii, 107, 108, 133.
*Darius, King*, i, 38, 39, 120; ii, 513.
*Darius* (of Alexander), ii, 14; (of the brothers La Taille), 15.
Darnley, Henry Stuart, Lord, i, 120, 255, 256.
Dasent, J. R., i, 237.
Dates, symmetry of, in Elizabethan drama, i, xxiv, xxv.
D'Aubigny, Duke of Lennox, Esme Stewart, Lord, i, 507.
Davenant, Sir William, i, 198, 317, 410; ii, 10, 184, 275, 308, 385, 421, 602, 603; and the masque, ii, 104, 132; his *Temple of Love*, and other masques, 135, 136; patent to, for the creation of a company of players, 299; his early comedies, 299–302; attempt of, to revive the tragedy of blood, 336, 341; influence of Fletcher on, 336, 340; early authorship of, 339, 340; succeeds Jonson as laureate, 339; *Gondibert*, an epic poem by, 340; and Greville, 340; influences of France on, 340; *Ode* on the death of Shakespeare, 340; alleged relationship with Shakespeare, 340; earlier dramas of, 340–342; the folio of, 342; and the forebears of the heroic play, 342–344, 347, 348; *Love and Honor* and other plays of the heroic type, 342–344; and Platonic love, 345–348; and the heroic play, 348, 352; intimacy of, with Suckling, 361; the reorganizer of the King's men at the Restoration, 386; writes for the King's company of players, 386; his revival of the tragedy of blood in *Albovine*, 424; an intermediary between Fletcher and heroical romance, 426; bibliography of, 522, 536.
Davenport, Robert, i, 280, 304, 305, 389, 594, 598, 599, 602; ii, 247–262, 424, 533.
*David and Absalom*, i, 37.
*David and Bethsabe*, i, 42, 43, 171, 179, 256; ii, 394, 456.
*David, Two Sins of King*, i, 37.
Davidson, C., i, 6, 12, 17–19, 21.
Davies, Sir John, i, 520.
Davies, John, of Hereford, ii, 194.
Davies, R., i, 15.
Davies, T., i, 26.
Davies, Thomas, i, 466.
Davison, Francis, ii, 99, 103, 411.
Day, John, i, 39, 168, 169, 178, 222, 223, 234, 281, 282, 284, 291, 292, 347, 354, 423, 429, 433, 562; ii, 31, 158, 360, 521, 545; *Maid's Metamorphosis* ascribed to, i, 132, 140; the work of, 397; not proved to be author of Parnassus Plays, ii, 67; probable author of *Maid's Metamorphosis*, 151; pastoral elements in comedies of, 151; and the "merry resourceful maiden," 251; described by Jonson as a rogue, 377; leaves the Admiral's men, 379; his lightsome comedies affected by Shakespeare and Lyly, 415; bibliography of, 480, 493, 525.
*De Una Causa Dos Efectos*, ii, 249.
*Dead Man's Fortune*, i, 196.
*Death, Dialogue of*, i, 61.
*Death of Robert, Earl of Huntington*, i, 279, 281, 283, 305; ii, 154.
*Débat*, the, i, 48, 73, 79; ii, 448.
*Debate between Body and Soul*, i, 48.
*Debate of the Carpenter's Tools*, i, 48.
*Decameron*, i, 196, 197, 301, 401, 439, 518, 537, 564; ii, 260.
Dee, John, i, 353; ii, 54.
*Defiance of Fortune*, i, 434.
Deimling, H., i, 19.
Dekker, Thomas, i, xxv, xxxii, xxxiv, xl, 412, 414, 421, 423, 429, 431, 447, 493, 509, 510, 547, 587, 603; ii, 40, 43, 137, 244, 309, 327, 328, 353, 360, 408; his service in the representation of contemporary life, i, xxix; and *The Virgin Martyr*, 43, 297, 328; *Gull's Hornbook*, 173, 175, 184, 270; and the *Sun's Darling*, 175, 396; and the *Roaring Girl*, 176, 327; *Honest Whore*, 177, 338, 339; influence of, on the drama, 193, 194; *Satiromastix*, 216, 218, 284; and *Lust's Dominion*, 222–224; and *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy*, 222, 223; and *Pierce of Exton*, 253, 280; and *Pierce of Winchester*, 253; and the comedy of everyday life, 278; *Bear a Brain* attributed to, 279, 280; *Old Fortunatus*, 122,

253, 284, 379, 390, 391, 404; *Shoemakers' Holiday*, 285, 297, 327, 329, 379; and *The Famous Victories of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 287, 288; *The Whore of Babylon*, 289, 359; *Truth's Supplication to Candlelight*, 289; the chronicle plays of, as literature, 307, 308; prices paid, 316; influenced by connection with Henslowe, 318; the domestic drama of, 318, 319, 326–335, 338–341; satire in, 327; life and work of, 327, 328; his life contrasted with that of Shakespeare, 328; and *Faustus*, 328; *Virgin Martyr* of Middleton and, 328; diversity of work of, 336; the *Honest Whore* of Middleton and, 338–340; the *Medicine for a Curst Wife* of, 340; collaborated on *Black Batman*, 345, 349; on *Stepmother's Tragedy*, and *Page of Plymouth*, 346; and the *Witch of Edmonton*, 348, 362; *If This be not a Good Play* of, 355, 357; Jonson in rivalry with, 357; the *Whore of Babylon* of, 359; use of witchcraft by, 359; the domestic drama of, 366; chronological relation of Shakespeare to, 378; and *Antonio and Vallia*, 379; *Agamemnon* of, 385; at his best in *Old Fortunatus*, 390, 391, 396; Fleay on, 396; the genius of, 396; comedies of, 396, 397; relation of to romantic comedy, 403, 404; anachronisms in, 472; and the "war of the theaters," 478, 481, 484–487; the success of his *Shoemakers' Holiday*, 500; his collaboration with Webster in comedies of London life, 502, 503; lost play of, 503, 504; his activity in popular mythological plays, ii, 20, 21; and the *Sun's Darling*, 95; and civic pageants, 128; his collaboration with Massinger, 229; his imitations of Fletcherian tragicomedy, 235, 236; satirized by Jonson, 268; friend of Brome, 269; productivity of, as a playwright, 374; his allusion to Jonson as an actor, 376; a writer for the Chamberlain's men, 379; personal relations of, 381; improvidence and imprisonment for debt of, 381; incessant collaboration of, 381; journalistic ease and fluency of, 381; praised by Webster, 382; share of, with Jonson in the welcome of James to London, 382; employed in civic pageants, 382; Heywood's verse on, 383; writes for the Princess Elizabeth's players, 384; a mercenary in the war of the theaters, 410; his and Middleton's dramatic treatment of the conflict of woman and man, 413; bibliography of, 456, 462, 480, 483, 484, 502.

*Delight, Comedy of*, i, 119.

*Delivery of Susannah*, i, 35.

Della Porta. See *Porta, G.-B. della.*

Deloney, Thomas, i, 297, 329, 347; ii, 483.

*Demetrius and Marsina*, ii, 39.

Demonstrator of the action, the, in the plays of Jonson, i, 536.

Denham, Sir John, i, 451.

Denmark, English players in, ii, 391.

*Deorum Judicium*, ii, 137.

*Deposing of Richard II*, i, 280.

Derby, Lord, his players, i, 142, 144–146; ii, 360.

*Deserving Favorite*, ii, 353, 426, 537.

Dessoff, A., i, 410; ii, 315.

De Thou, Jaques Auguste, ii, 11.

Devereux, Penelope. See *Rich, Penelope.*

Devil, the, in the drama, i, 232, 354–358, 365, 386–390, 403; ii, 261.

*Devil and his Dame*, i, 119.

*Devil is an Ass*, i, 357, 358, 537, 538; ii, 263, 264, 276; ii, 486, 499.

*Devil of Dowgate*, i, 499, 521.

*Devil's Charter*, i, 389, 390, 410, 436, 552, 569; ii, 262, 331, 493, 494.

*Devil's Law Case*, i, 237, 243.

Devonshire, Charles Blount, Earl of, i, 465; ii, 331.

De Witt, John, i, 161, 162, 166, 174.

De Worde, Winkin, i, 62.

Dialect in Jonson, i, 326.

Dialogue, or *débat*, the, i, 48, 73, 79; ii, 448.

Dialogue, Shakespeare's, 370, 371; Lyly's influence on, 370, 371, 392.

Dibden, J. C., ii, 391.

*Diccon of Bedlam.* See *Gammer Gurton's Needle.*

*Dick of Devonshire*, i, 293; ii, 288, 424.

Dickens, Charles, i, 278.

Didacticism in the drama, i, 28, 309.

*Dido* (of Rightwise), i, 83, ii, 18; (of Gager), i, 121, ii, 18, 59, 404; (of Halliwell), i, 550, ii, 18, 56, 57; (college play), ii, 3; bibliography, 513.

*Dido and Æneas* (interlude), ii, 19; (listed by Henslowe), 18, 19.
*Dido, Queen of Carthage*, i, 138, 139, 234, 266; ii, 18, 19, 404, 407, 513.
*Didone*, i, 209; ii, 462, 467.
*Digby Manuscript*, i, 29, 40, 41, 52.
*Digby Plays*, i, 12, 24, 29, 30, 40, 41, 52, 177.
Digges, Leonard, i, 206; ii, 210.
Dio Cassius, ii, 35, 41, 42.
*Diocletian*, i, 328; ii, 18, 38, 40.
Diogenes Laertius, i, 132.
Disguise, use of, i, 73, 75, 76, 104, 279, 283, 459, 460, 533; ii, 409.
*Disobedient Child*, i, 64, 65, 81; ii, 396.
*Disordered Life of the Countess of Celant*, i, 585.
*Distracted Emperor*. See *Charlemagne*.
*Distracted State*, ii, 365.
*Distresses*. See *Spanish Lovers*.
Dobell, B., i, 416, 507.
Dolce, Luigi, i, 99, 104, 209, 230; ii, 2, 462, 467.
Domestic drama, i, 92, 309–366; in the earlier drama, 309–311; examples of, in the earliest "regular" plays, 310; low life pictured in, 311; realistic comedy prepared the way for, 312; assumes artistic importance, 312; playwrights with Henslowe excelled in, 318, 319; varieties of, 319; affected by other kinds of plays about it, 319; best illustrated by typical plays, 319; position of Greene and Peele in, 319–321; *Wily Beguiled* an exceptional example of, 320; types of the single comedy in, 321–328; *Merry Wives* Shakespeare's only contribution to, 324; but displays Shakespeare's pre-eminence, 325; place of Dekker and Heywood in, 326–339; theme of the faithful wife in, 329–335; and of the tyrannic husband and prodigal son, 330, 331; the shrew and curst wife as motives in, 339–343; the murder plays, 343–349; might have developed an indigenous tragedy, 345; *Fair Quarrel* finest later example of, 350; the supernatural in, 353–364; the devil in, 354–358; witchcraft in, 358–364; journalistic instinct in, 364; summary of, 364, 366; Middleton's proper work lay in, 381; realism in the, 455; already mature in *Gammer Gurton*, ii, 402; the flourishing period of, 408; in the reign of James, 412; bibliography of, 481–487.
Dominis, Antonio de, i, 444.
*Don Giovanni*, ii, 247.
*Don Lope de Cardona*, ii, 317.
Donne, John, i, 492.
Dorlandus, P., i, 57.
Dorset, Richard, fifth Earl of, i, 427.
*Double Falsehood*, ii, 212.
*Double Marriage*, i, 601-603; ii, 204, 213.
*Doubtful Heir*, ii, 286, 317, 318.
Dowden, Edward, i, 273, 458.
*Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington*, i, 279, 280; ii, 154, 479.
Drake, Sir Francis, i, 241.
Drama, the, growth and subsidence of, in Tudor and Stuart times, i, xxiii, xxiv; symbolic, didactic, and artistic phases in the growth of, xxiii; the peculiar art of the Elizabethan age, xxiii; its Elizabethan diversity of species, xxiv; the chronology of, mapped out, xxv, xxvi; the religious element in, xxvii; the vernacular element in, xxvii, xxviii; national spirit in, xxviii; its glory, its reflection of actual life, xxix; the element of romance in, xxix, xxx; classical influence on, xxxi, xxxii; romantic bias for classical themes in, xxxi, xxxii; Jonson's several services to, xxxiii; variety of, explained in the mingling of the above elements, xxxiv; popular, romantic, and scholarly schools of, xxxiv, xxxv; diversity of Elizabethan, illustrated in Shakespeare, xxxv, xxxvi; eclectic character of post-Shakespearean drama, xxxvi, xxxvii; the strain after originality, xxxvii; universality of the appeal of Elizabethan, xxxviii, xxxix; function of, in guiding public opinion, xxxix; employed for satire and current comment, xxxix, xl; imaginative quality of Elizabethan, xl; amateurishness of Elizabethan, xli; its large appeal, xli; later narrowing of the constituency of, xli; Elizabethan, a great national utterance, xlii; of old time not separated from literature, xlii; of Elizabethan period takes its rise in the miracle play and morality, 1 (and see *Sacred drama*); influence of medieval drama on the Elizabethan, 30; significance of Buchanan in the devel-

opment of the, 34; the place of the morality in the history of the, 45–72 (see *Morality*); transition to the earlier secular, 73–77; the interlude, 77 (see *Interlude*); classical influence on earlier secular, 81–86; academic plays, 84–86; earliest "regular English plays," 86–92; early, of school and court, 93–140 (and see *Court play*); influence of court on, 98–105; early origin of the various types of, 193, 194; romantic spirit in the, 194, 195 (see, also, *Romantic drama*); the influence of Greene and his contemporaries on, 245; the "national historical" type of the, 247–308 (and see *Chronicle play*); the "domestic" type of, 281, 309–366 (see, also, *Domestic drama*); historical, based on foreign themes, 405–453; extended scope of subject in Elizabethan, 454; the further development of comedy, 454–548 (and see *Comedy*); stage history, 1603–14, 493–498; provincial visits of the theatrical companies, 493, 494; the companies pass under royal patronage, 495, 496; "the five companies," 497; act to restrain profanity and institute censorship, 498; the romantic tragedy, 549–606 (and see *Tragedy*); relation of comedy and tragedy in Elizabethan, 549, 550; classical influences on English, ii, 1–5; classical sources, 1–50; of the colleges, 51–92 (see, also, *College drama*); academic versus popular, 51, 52; attacks upon, 60; the masque, 93–138 (see, also, *Masque*); statutes against the stage, 141, 142, 369, 370; the "pastoral type" of the, 139–181 (and see *Pastoral*); place of the tragicomedy and "romance" in the, 182–239 (see, also, *Tragicomedy*); the later comedy of manners, 240–306; stage history, 1614–25, 241–243; the decadence of the romantic, 307–370; stage history of the reign of Charles I, 310, 311; ethical deterioration in the, 333; in retrospect, 371–431; between 1558 and 1642, 371–373; academic versus the popular, 387; chief names in the academic, 387, 388; contributions of the academic, 388; extravagance of the art of the Elizabethan, 388; characteristics of this art, 389; influence of Elizabethan, on the German stage, 392; characteristics of medieval, 396, 399; résumé of history of Elizabethan, 393–428; roots of, in its medieval forebears, 393–396; vital element the touch with life, 396; true progenitors of, the moralities depicting social and political life, 396; indigenous character of, 396; John Heywood and the birth of the artistic element in, 397, 400; place of legend and balladry among the forebears of, 399; the heroical element in, 399; Lyly's lift of, into an art, 400; classical influences on, 400; Plautus and, 400, 401; Senecan influence on, 401, 402; the variety of, presaged in the first decades of Elizabeth's reign, 402–404; the period of Lyly, 404, 405; the first great tragedies of, 405; the period of Marlowe, 405–407; the diversity of, at its height, 405–407; the period of Shakespeare, 407–411; flourishing of the chronicle play, romantic comedy, and domestic drama, 408; superficial character of the romantic settings of some plays of, 408; combination of romantic with other elements in, 408, 409; comedy of disguise, Jonson's comedy of humors, and dramatic satires, 409, 410; classical history as treated by Shakespeare, Jonson, and Marston, 410; revival of the tragedy of revenge, 410, 411; the masque and pastoral as contributions to, 411, 412; diversity of, in the first years of James, 412, 413; height of romantic tragedy, 413; the flourishing of romantic comedy and the earlier comedy of manners, 414, 451; Shakespearean "romance" and Fletcherian tragicomedy, 416, 417; the period of Jonson, 418; dramas of contemporary allusion, 418; the period of Fletcher, 419–421; degeneracy in moral tone of later, 421; pervading influence of Fletcher in the time of Charles, 423–425; persistence of the influence of Jonson, 425; degeneracy of, 425; the period of Shirley 427, 428.

Dramatists. See *Playwrights*.

Drayton, Michael, i, 250, 279, 394, 412, 587; ii, 7, 22, 106, 252, 253, 280; remuneration paid, i, 316, 317; *Merry Devil* ascribed to, i, 323; and the *Lon-*

*don Prodigal*, 333; and the *Black Batman*, 349; estimate of, in *The Return from Parnassus*, ii, 69; leaves the Admiral's men, 379; writes intermittently for the Chamberlain's company, 379; visit of, to Shakespeare, 380; bibliography of, 482.
Drue, Thomas, i, 304, 594; ii, 261, 262.
Drummond, William, i, 466, 477, 483, 508, 541; ii, 91, 115, 122, 123, 166, 167, 377, 498.
Drury, G. T., ii, 10, 342.
Drury, William, i, 253; ii, 84, 519.
Drury Lane theater. See *Cockpit*.
Dryden, John, i, xxxi, xxxiii, 98, 166; ii, 184, 199, 273, 308, 348, 352, 421, 536; on Jonson's "dotages," i, 533; on the learning and borrowings of Jonson, 537; his mistake as to *Albumazar* as a source of *The Alchemist*, ii, 78; on the superiority of Fletcher's to Shakespeare's gentlemen, 251; his criticism of the last plays of Jonson, 267; affirms Davenant the inventor of the heroic play, 343; preface of, *Of Heroic Plays*, 343; his *Conquest of Granada* and *Aureng-Zebe*, 349; his prologue to Carlell's *Arviragus and Philicia*, 356.
Dublin, the new theater in, ii, 285, 286.
*Duchess of Malfi*, i, 409, 552, 568, 583, 589–594; ii, 179, 237, 312, 414, 419, 420, 428, 452, 510.
*Duchess of Suffolk*, i, 304, 594; ii, 481.
Dudley, Lord Robert, i, 353.
Dugdale, W., ii, 119.
*Duke Humphrey*, i, 307.
*Duke of Milan and the Marquis of Mantua*, i, 119, 211, 408, 410, 569, 595, 604, 605.
*Duke's Mistress*, ii, 320, 321.
Dulwich College, i, 314, 315; ii, 239.
*Dumb Knight*, i, 203, 204, 445; ii, 35.
Dumb shows, i, 256, 262.
Dunbar, William, i, 77.
Dunlop, J., ii, 178.
Dunstan, St., i, 4, 255, 294, 356.
Durand, W. Y., i, 107, 108, 113, 157; ii, 58.
D'Urfé, Honoré, ii, 169, 173, 178.
*Dutch Courtesan*, i, 333, 334, 542–544, 586.
Dutch history as dramatic material, i, 434, 441; ii, 496.
Dyce, A., i, 168, 199, etc., *passim*.

Eades, Richard. See *Geddes*.
*Earl Godwin*, i, 253.
Easter play, i, 7; ii, 443, 444.
*Eastward Hoe*, i, xxxv, 169, 229, 470, 488, 493, 504–509, 542, 546; ii, 252, 254, 396, 415, 499, 502.
Eckert, E., i, 53.
Edgar, King, i, 255, 294.
Edmund Ironsides, i, 253.
*Edward I*, i, 136, 256, 261, 262; ii, 456, 471.
*Edward II*, i, 230, 233, 234, 261, 267–270, 274, 275, 285, 551; ii, 406, 472.
Edward III, i, 234, 252, 260.
*Edward III*, i, 234, 273, 378, 411, 595; ii, 472.
*Edward IV*, i, 261, 263, 281–283, 337, 397, 499.
Edward VI, i, 32, 60, 61, 64, 77, 78, 249; ii, 395; the *Whore of Babylon* attributed to, i, 289.
Edward, Prince (the Black Prince), i, 298.
Edwards, Richard, i, 98, 112–115, 120, 121, 123, 187, 310, 311; ii, 57, 58, 198, 454.
*Edwardus Confessor, Sanctus*, i, 253.
"*Effiginia*." See *Iphigenia*.
*Egerton MS.*, i, 253, 280.
Einstein, L., i, 93.
*Elckerlijk*, i, 57; ii, 450.
*Elder Brother*, ii, 205, 246, 249.
Elderton, William, i, 85, 112; ii, 454.
Elinor, Queen (of Castile), i, 262.
Elizabeth, Queen, i, xxiv, xxv, xxix, 12, 26, 37, 60, 68, 69, 78, 81, 83, 84, 87, 93–106, 110, 111, 113, 114, 116, 117, 121, 124, 125, 127–131, 135, 141–144, 195–197, 247–249, 252, 265, 287–289, 324, 348, 353, 378, 391, 445, 480; ii, 4, 10, 56–58, 72, 97, 395, 452, 512.
Elizabeth, Stuart, Princess (afterwards Queen of Bohemia), i, 437; ii, 115–117, 122; her company of players, i, 146, 495, 513; ii, 241, 242, 245, 310, 377, 383, 384, 404.
*Elizabeth, Troubles of Queen*. See *If You Know Not Me*.
"Elizabethan," the term defined, i, xxiii.
Ellis, G., i, 347.
Ellis, H., i, 70.

Elsinore, ii, 391, 461.
Elyot, Sir Thomas, i, 82.
Elze, K., i, 290, 438.
*Emperor of the East*, ii, 38, 40, 43.
*Endimion*, i, 109, 124, 127–132, 135, 240, 369, 386, 387, 396.
*Engaños, Comedia de los*, ii, 194.
"English, a language unfit for the university," ii, 75.
*English Moor*, ii, 273.
English spirit in the drama, i, xxvii; subsides with the accession of James I, xxxix.
English themes and setting, i, 151–154, 298, 305, 306, 325, 343, 349, 372, 375, 376, 387, 388, 454, 455, 523; also *passim* in chapter on *Domestic Drama*.
*English Traveller*, i, 336–338, 363, 457; ii, 88, 262, 309, 425, 539.
*Englishmen for My Money*, i, 500, 501, 546.
"Entertainment," the, ii, 94; its nucleus a speech of welcome, 94.
*Entertainment at Althorpe*, ii, 101, 102.
*Entertainment of the Two Kings at Theobald's*, ii, 94.
"Entry," the, of the masque, ii, 94.
*Ephesian Matron*, i, 462.
*Epicœne*, i, xxxv, 206, 273, 277, 471, 524, 530, 531, 536, 538, 539; ii, 277, 415, 499, 500.
Epiphany, play of the, i, 7.
Erasmus, i, 82, 93, 286; ii, 137.
*Error, History of*, i, 119.
Essex, Frances Howard, Countess of, i, 585; ii, 105, 166.
Essex, Robert Devereux, second Earl of, i, 122, 144, ii, 10; his players, i, 144.
Essex, Robert Devereux, third Earl of, ii, 105, 121, 338.
Essex rebellion, the, i, 494.
Este, Leonora d', i, 409.
*Estrife*, the, i, 48, 73, 79; ii, 448.
Ethenwold, i, 4.
Etheridge, Sir George, ii, 416.
*Ethiopia, Queen of*, ii, 16, 48.
Eton, ii, 56.
Eucharist, the, in relation to the drama, i, 6.
*Eumenides*, i, 577.
*Eunuchus*, i, 457; ii, 58.
*Euphormus*, ii, 83.
Euphuism, i, 126–127, 130; ii, 455.
*Euribates*, ii, 75.
Euripides, i, 34, 37, 83, 91, 97; ii, 1, 2, 55, 59, 388, 401, 511.
Eutropius, ii, 41.
Evans, H. A., ii, 93.
*Every Man in His Humor*, i, xxv, 303, 462, 466, 467, 471, 478, 488, 529; ii, 68, 266, 380, 410, 499.
*Every Man Out of His Humor*, i, 460, 467, 470, 479, 481, 482, 488, 536; ii, 34, 68, 266, 410, 499.
*Every Woman in Her Humor*, i, 471, 472.
*Everyman*, i, 57–58, 81; ii, 394, 450.
*Evoradanus, Prince of Denmark*, i, 434.
*Example*, ii, 294, 296, 315.
*Exchange Ware at Second Hand*. See *Band, Cuff, and Ruff*.
Exeter, ii, 243, 391.
*Ezechias*, i, 38; ii, 50.

Fabyan, Robert, i, 250.
*Faery Pastorall*, i, 174.
*Faery Queen*, i, 128, 197, 199, 289, 356, 393; ii, 125, 399.
*Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo*, ii, 234.
*Fair Em*, i, 180, 189–191, 201, 259, 261, 476; ii, 399, 479.
*Fair Favorite*, ii, 342, 344, 426.
*Fair Maid of Bristow*, i, 285, 332–334, 366; ii, 484.
*Fair Maid of Italy*, i, 379.
*Fair Maid of the Exchange*, i, 349, 499, 501, 502; ii, 485.
*Fair Maid of the Inn*, ii, 206, 207.
*Fair Maid of the West*, i, xxxix, 292; ii, 357.
*Fair Quarrel*, i, xlii, 350–352, 365, 510; ii, 236, 245, 419.
Fairholt, F. W., ii, 124, 128.
Fairies, i, 245, 354, 379, 386, 387, 391–396, 403.
*Fairy Knight*, ii, 328.
*Faith and Mercy*, i, 85.
*Faithful Friends*, ii, 37, 41, 242.
*Faithful Shepherd*, ii, 171, 412, 417.
*Faithful Shepherdess*, ii, 158–161, 175, 180, 525, 526.
Faithful wife as a dramatic theme, i, 329–339; ii, 484.
*Faithfulness and Mercy*, i, 118.
Falkland, Henry Cary, fourth Viscount, ii, 365, 537.
Falkland, Lucius Cary, second Viscount, ii, 365.

Fall of princes, the, as a tragic theme, i, 569.
*Fallacy*, ii, 82.
*False One*, i, 574, 603; ii, 40, 41, 516.
Falstaff, i, 276–279, 324, 359, 463, 468, 469; ii, 478.
*Famæ Comœdia*, i, 37.
*Family of Love*, i, 513.
*Famous History of Captain Thomas Stukeley*. See *Stukely*.
*Famous History of Sir Thomas Wyatt*. See *Wyatt*.
*Famous History of the Life of Henry VIII*, i, 168, 288, 290.
*Famous Victories of Henry V*. See *Henry V*.
*Fancies Chaste and Noble*, ii, 297, 298.
*Fancy's Festival*, ii, 136.
Fanshaw, Richard, ii, 144.
*Fantesca*, ii, 77.
*Farce*, the French, i, 73, 80, 94, 311, 322, 323, 343.
Farmer, J. S., i, 62, 79, 221.
Farmer, R., ii, 28.
Farquhar, George, ii, 247.
*Fatal Brothers*, ii, 261.
*Fatal Contract*, i, 426, 427; ii, 36, 364.
*Fatal Dowry*, i, 352, 603, 604; ii, 229, 234, 419, 532.
*Fatal Love*, i, 421.
*Fatum Vortigerni*, i, 296; ii, 80, 481.
*Fault in Friendship*, ii, 261, 269.
*Faust* (of Goethe), i, 232; ii, 14.
*Faust Book*, ii, 392.
Faust-drama in Germany, ii, 392.
*Fausten, Historia von D. Johann*, i, 231.
*Faustus, Historie of Dr. John* (source of Marlowe's play), i, 231.
*Faustus, Tragicall History of Dr.*, i, xxvi, 168, 175, 185, 232, 233, 238, 244, 268, 269, 321, 328, 354, 357, 358, 387, 412, 436, 569; ii, 40, 406, 467, 468.
*Fawn*. See *Parasitaster*.
*Feast and Welcome*, ii, 234.
Feast of Fools, i, 14, 46, 54, 73; ii, 447.
Feast of Innocents, i, 46.
*Felix and Philomena*, i, 371; ii, 205.
*Female Rebellion*, ii, 238, 532.
Fenton, Geoffrey, i, 132, 341, 390; ii, 488, 493.
Ferdinand I, of Germany, i, 453.
Ferrant, Richard, i, 112.
Ferrers, George, i, 76; ii, 451.
*Ferrex and Porrex*. See *Gorboduc*.
Feuillerat, A., i, 427; ii, 338.
*Fidele and Fortunio*, i, 210, 211.
Field, John, i, xxxviii, 473.
Field, Nathaniel, i, 117, 156, 185, 441, 528, 599; ii, 38, 185, 251, 376; his relations with Shakespeare, i, 271; given over to the comedy of manners in the reign of James, 351; and the *Fatal Dowry*, 352; details of the life of, 473; his cleverness as an actor, 497; his new company the Queen's Revels at Whitefriars, 497; his female parts in earlier plays of Jonson, and Beaumont and Fletcher, 519; taught to write plays by Jonson, 519; becomes a King's man, 519; his retirement to the trade of stationer, 519; his comedies of manners, 519, 520; their Middletonian character, 520; Shakespeare reminiscence in, 520; influence of Jonson on, 520; the masque in the plays of, ii, 128; his collaboration with Massinger, 228, 229; joins the King's company, 242; educated by Jonson, 269, 381; bibliography of, 503.
*Filli di Sciro*, ii, 178.
*Finding of Troth*, i, 55.
*Fine Companion*, ii, 276.
Fiorentino, Giovanni, i, 324.
Firth, C. H., ii, 284.
Fischer, R., i, 97.
Fisher, Jasper, i, 306; ii, 80.
Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., ii, 206, 207, 233.
Fitzstephen, William, i, 12.
"Five Companies of London, the," i, 495; ii, 310.
*Five New Plays*, ii, 270, 366.
*Five Plays in One*, i, 401.
Fleay, F. G., i, xxv, 37, etc., *passim*.
*Fleir*, the i, 518, 545.
Fletcher, Giles, the Elder, i, 524; ii, 164.
Fletcher, Giles, the Younger, i, 524; ii, 164.
Fletcher, John, i, xxiv, xxx, xli, xlii, 407, 433, 439, 452, 497, 505, 511, 516, 517; ii, 49, 242, 245, 254, 282, 292, 295, 296, 304, 307–309, 329, 337, 340, 365, 385, 428; his influence on Shakespeare exaggerated, xxxvi, eclectic method of, xxxvi; his succession to the primacy of Shakespeare, xxxvii; contrasted with Shakespeare, 181; and the *Knight of the Burning Pestle*, 202, 206, 207; *Bonduca*, 253, 302,

303; and *The Famous History of the Life of Henry VIII*, 168, 288, 290; not mentioned in Henslowe, 315; *Woman's Prize* of, 341; relations of Shakespeare and, 342; *Rule a Wife* of, 343; influence of, 349; given over to comedy of manners in the reign of James, 351; heroical romance of, 385; in romantic comedy, 400–402, 404; the comedy of manners and pastoral of, 400; chronology of earlier plays of, 401; his French histories, 423–426; his and Massinger's *Barnavelt*, 440–441; born a gentleman, 523; his association with Beaumont, 524; his collaboration with Beaumont, Massinger, and Shakespeare, 524; chronology of Beaumont and, 525; the first work of, comedy of manners, 525; his early imitation of Middleton, 526; his comedies of London life, 526–528; his success in sketches of contemporary life, 545; his and Massinger's *The False One*, 573, 574, 586, 594–596, 599–602, 606; influence of Beaumont and, in tragedy, 600–602, 606; his clever manipulation of stock characters and situations, 602; his success in tragedy, 602, 603; his dramas in classic setting, ii, 37–41, 50; his *Faithful Shepherdess*, 158–161; his conception of the pastoral, 159, 164, 165, 175, 179; his relations to Beaumont and to other dramatists, 184, 185; his prolonged activity, 185; collaboration of, with various dramatists, 185, 186, 190, 198; the "notes" of, 186, 187; quality of the blank verse of, 186, 187; sentence structure and phrasing of, 187; his superficiality, 188; chief author of the Beaumont and Fletcher plays, 189; stage history of, 189, 190; Jonson and, 190; *Philaster* and plays of its type, 193–197; and *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, 198, 199, 200; other tragicomedies of, 204–227; Spanish sources of plays of, 206–216; Cervantes a source of, 206, 209; Spanish sources employed by, in translation, 208, 215; Flores and other Spanish authors and, 209–212; his likeness in temper to Lope de Vega, 209; *Love's Cure*, not by, 214, 215; period of Spanish influence on, 216; not directly affected by contemporary Spanish drama, 216; tragicomedies of Italian and other source, 218–227; Shakespearean reminiscences in, 220; typical later tragedies of, 220–227; the ideal knight of, 221; the moral taint of, 222, 223; "unmaidenly modesty" of women of, 225; collaboration of, with Massinger, 226–228; influence of, on his contemporaries in tragicomedy, 235–239; imitations of his manner and style, 237, 239; activity of, in later comedies of manners, 244; gives over English settings for comedy, 246; later comedies, in foreign garb, 247–252; coarseness of speech and brutality of, towards women, 248; types in the personages of, 250; conventional realism of, 251; the gentlemen of, 251; the capability of, in comedy, 252; a collaborator with Jonson, 268; his foil for Arethusa in *Philaster*, 334; influence of, on his successors, 336; his Evadne in *The Maid's Tragedy*, 341; tragicomedy of, and the heroic play, 350; the method of contrast in plays of, and the heroic play, 351; a gentleman born, 376; access of, to gentle society, 381; praised by Webster, 382; Heywood's word of, 383; collaboration and relation of, with Shakespeare, 383, 386; succeeds Shakespeare as chief poet of the King's players, 384; death of, by the plague, 384; close personal relations of, with Massinger, 384, 386; plays of, in Germany, 392; the failure of, to popularize the pastoral drama in his *Faithful Shepherdess*, 412; his sequel to Shakespeare's *Shrew*, 413; his romantic paternity in Shakespeare, 415; his following of the Middletonian comedy of manners, 416; the tragicomedy of Beaumont and its contrast with the "romance" of Shakespeare, 416, 417; the contribution of Beaumont and, to romantic drama, 417, 418; the method of, that of contrast and surprise, 417; the technique of Beaumont and, 418; the period of, 419–421; use by, of Spanish sources, 420; qualities of, as a playwright, 420, 421; the complete dramatist, 421; and the degeneracy of later drama, 421–423;

the change wrought by, in romantic drama, 423; pervading and lasting quality of the influence of, 423–425; the tragicomedy of, chief among the forebears of the heroic play, 426; bibliography of, 480, 481, 495, 496, 505, 516, 525–530. See, also, *Beaumont and Fletcher*.
Fletcher, J. B., ii, 346, 347.
Fletcher, Lawrence, i, 494, 495; ii, 391.
Fletcher, Phineas, i, 524; ii, 80, 164–166, 179, 525.
Fletcher, Richard, i, 523, 524.
*Floating Island*, ii, 81, 82, 89, 90, 520.
Flores, Juan de, ii, 205, 209, 238.
*Florimene*, ii, 171, 178.
Flower, Francis, i, 105.
*Flowers, Masque of*, ii, 118, 126.
Flügel, E., i, 87, 95, 96.
*Fol et du sage, Dialogue du*, i, 81.
Folk-drama, i, 48, 49; ii, 447.
Folk-lore, as a source for, or appearing in the drama, i, 201, 240, 254, 258, 259, 283–285, 321, 354, 356. See, also, *Devil, Fairies, Supernatural, Witches*.
*Fool and Her Maidenhead Soon Parted*, ii, 261, 262.
*Fool would be a Favorite*, ii, 355.
Ford, John, i, xxxvii, xlii, 606; ii, 37, 43, 137, 308, 377, 385, 392; and the *Sun's Darling*, i, 175, 396; and *Perkin Warbeck*, 305, 308; and the *Witch of Edmonton*, 348, 362; and the *Late Murder of a Son*, 349; use of witchcraft by, 359; his and Dekker's *Sun's Darling*, ii, 95; in comedy, 297, 298; in romantic drama, 327–336; a legal agent or factor, 327, non-extant plays of, 328; amateur pose of, 328; poetical casuistry of, 330; and Barnes, 331; originality of, in plot, 333; freedom of, from Italian influence, 333; beauty of the verse of, 333; trifling with vice in the tragedies of, 334; strained and intolerable situations of the tragedies of, 334; dramatic method of, analysis of emotion, 334–336; Heywood's word of, 383; criminal passion treated by way of problem by, in *'Tis Pity*, 422; *Perkin Warbeck* of, a problem drama, 424; the art of, 427; the success of, short-lived, 427, 428; bibliography of, ii, 481, 534, 535, 537.
Forde, Thomas, ii, 39, 176, 178.
Forgeries of Collier, i, 411, 430; ii, 375.
Forman, Dr. Simon, i, 280, 299; ii, 201.
Forsett, Edward, ii, 62, 519.
*Fortitude of Judith*, i, 35.
*Fortunate Isles*, ii, 124.
*Fortunatus*, i, 354.
*Fortune, Play of*, i, 115, 122.
*Fortune by Land and Sea*, i, xxxix, 292, 349; ii, 357.
Fortune theatre, the, i, xxvi, xxxiv, 146, 154, 160, 313, 366, 472, 483, 496, 557; ii, 242, 311, 379.
Fouchet, Claude, i, 424.
*Fountain of New Fashions*, i, 399, 461.
*Four Elements, Nature of the*, i, 62; ii, 395.
*Four Honored Loves*, ii, 263.
*Four P's*, i, xviii, 80, 81, 400, 401; ii, 193.
*Four Plays in One*, i, 568.
*Four Prentices of London*, i, 205, 206, 397, 404; ii, 348, 359, 406.
*Four Sons of Aymon*, i, 203.
*Four Sons of Fabius*, i, 118.
*Fox*. See *Volpone*.
*Fox and the Kid*, i, 216.
Foxe, John, i, 39, 40, 59, 250, 286, 304.
Fraenkel, L., ii, 92.
France, English players in, ii, 461.
Francis I of France, i, 420, 453.
Fraser, M. E. N., i, 294, 346, 468.
Fraunce, Abraham, ii, 62, 82, 144.
*Fraus Pia*, ii, 75.
Fredegonda, Queen of Neustria, i, 424, 427.
Frederick V, Elector Palatine, ii, 115.
*Frederick and Basilea*, i, 196, 228, 229.
Freeman, Ralph, ii, 364, 402, 537.
*Freewill*, i, 60, 81.
*Freires of Berwick*, ii, 261.
French interpolated in early religious drama, i, 9, 19.
"French Seneca," influence of, ii, 5–16, 76, 340.
French themes and influence, i, 214, 374, 378, 392, 398, 400, 407, 408, 410–427; ii, 5–16, 76, 340, 351, 407, 426, 451, 454, 485, 494, 495, 500, 512, 530, 531, 536.
*Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay*, i, 178, 194, 244, 245, 259, 283, 284, 378, 387–389; ii, 154, 169, 261, 406, 467, 470.
*Friar Fox and Gillian of Brentford*, i, 355.
*Friar Francis*, i, 345, 355.

*Friar Rush and the Proud Woman of Antwerp*, i, 354, 355.
*Friar Spendleton*, i, 355.
Fries, C., i, 34.
Friesen, H. von, i, 324.
*Fuimus Troes*, i, 306; ii, 80.
Fuller, H. De W., i, 220–222, 570; ii, 92.
Fuller, Thomas, i, 205; ii, 64.
Fulwell, Ulpian, i, 68, 310.
Furness, H. H., i, 184, 217, 362, 561; ii, 92, 152, 202, 203, 205.
Furnivall, F. J., i, 14; ii, 70, etc., *passim*.
*Furnivall Miscellany*, i, 23, and *passim*.
*Furza de la Costumbre*, ii, 214.

Gaedertz, K. T., i, 161.
Gager, William, i, 121; ii, 4, 18, 59, 60, 63, 404, 518.
*Gallathea*, i, 109, 124, 128, 132, 387, 393; ii, 149, 150, 154.
Galleries, in the theatre, i, 160, 161.
Games, dramatized, as basis of plays, i, 445.
*Game at Chess*, i, 408, 429, 443–445, 453, 510; ii, 419, 496, 503.
*Game of Cards*, i, 445.
*Gamelyn, Tale of*, ii, 154, 491.
*Gamester*, ii, 285, 292–294, 297, 304, 428, 534.
*Gammer Gurton's Needle*, i, xxviii, 86, 87, 91, 92, 104, 193, 310, 492; ii, 58, 402, 451.
Gardiner, Stephen, Bishop of Winchester, i, 59, 60, 152, 288; ii, 54.
Gardiner, S. R., ii, 293.
Garnett, R., ii, 143.
Garnier, Robert, i, 213, 223; ii, 2, 5–7, 156, 340.
Garrick, David, ii, 293.
Garter, Thomas, i, 38.
Gascoigne, George, i, xxxi, xxxii, 65, 66, 92, 110, 121, 135; 196, 210, 265, 341, 436, 492, 509; ii, 2, 91, 92, 97, 98, 375; as courtier and playwright, 94; employed by Leicester, 103; importance of the plays of, 104, 105; his innovation of comic prose dialogue, 105; *Supposes*, 104, 105; an amateur playwright, 139, 187; his indebtedness to Latin and Italian sources, 457; his entertainments, ii, 144, 145; his relation to the pastoral, 145; pedagogical moralities emerge into true drama in *The Glass of Government* by, 395; his *Supposes* based on Plautus by way of Italian intermediaries, 401; his *Jocasta*, Seneca by way of Dolce, 401; bibliography of, ii, 453, 496.
Gaud, W. S., i, 136, 256.
Gautier, L., i, 3.
Gaveston, Piers, Earl of Cornwall, i, 268.
Gayley, C. W., i, 12, 18, etc., *passim*.
Geddes, Richard, ii, 21, 22.
Gehler, V., i, 305.
Genée, R., i, 165.
Genest, John, i, 305; ii, 237, 283, 342, 365.
Genseric, ii, 45.
Gent, J. W., i, 306.
Gent, P. F., i, 231.
*Gentle Craft*, i, 297, 329.
*Gentleman Usher*, i, 352, 398, 415, 463, 464; ii, 494, 497.
*Gentleman of Venice*, ii, 286.
*Gentleness and Nobility*, i, 79.
Geoffrey, Abbot of St. Albans, i, 11.
Geoffrey of Monmouth, i, 293, 298.
*George a Greene*, i, 194, 245, 259, 260, 283, 285, 312, 498; ii, 406, 470, 479.
Georgievitz, B., ii, 11.
Gericke, R., i, 560.
German history as dramatic material, i, 434–441; ii, 494, 496.
German versions of English plays, i, 216, 217, 220, 221, 285.
Germany, English players in, ii, 391, 461.
*Gesta Grayorum* of 1594, ii, 73, 98–100, 103, 411.
*Gesta Romanorum*, i, 373; ii, 30.
Ghost, the, in the drama, i, 386, 553, 554, 577–584; ii, 303, 508, 509.
*Ghost*, ii, 303.
Gifford, William, i, 117, 173, 326, 356, 361, 478, 604; ii, 25, 34, 104, 282, 285, 347, 386.
Gilchrist, O. G., ii, 79.
Giles, Nathaniel, i, 115–116, 472, 473; ii, 369, 454.
Giles, Thomas, i, 112, 124, 146, 186.
*Giocasta*, i, 104.
Gipsies in the drama, ii, 123, 216–219.
*Gipsies Metamorphosed*, ii, 18.
Girardin, S., ii, 346.
*Gismond of Salern*. See *Tancred and Gismunda*.
*Gitanilla*, ii, 206, 217.

Glapthorne, Henry, i, 442, 448, 452, 602, 606; ii, 176, 275, 295, 336; his comedies, *The Hollander* and *Wit in a Constable*, ii, 278, 279; his *Lady Mother*, 278, 279; Shakespearean borrowings in, 278, 279; his heroic play, *The Ladies' Privilege*, 344, 345; bibliography, 533.
*Glass of Government*, i, xxxi, 65, 66, 81, 92, 94, 104, 509; ii, 395, 453.
Globe theater, the, i, xxxv, xxxviii, 146, 153, 155, 156, 159, 160, 182–184, 313, 368, 383, 460, 472, 481, 489, 496, 497; ii, 36, 241, 242, 311, 391.
Gloucester, Richard, Duke of, his players, i, 142.
Gloucester, Thomas of Woodstock, Duke of, i, 280.
*Goblins*, ii, 362.
*Godfrey of Boulogne*, i, 203.
*Godly Queen Hester*. See *Hester*.
*Godwin, Earl*, i, 253.
Goedeke, K., i, 51, 58.
Goethe, J. W. von, i, 232, 355, 559; i, 14.
Goffe, Thomas, i, 598; ii, 43, 45, 81, 169, 170, 174, 179; his melodramas on Turkish history, i, 449; the Turkish tragedies of, their reversion to the type of the earlier conqueror plays, 553.
"Going Out" of the masque, ii, 94.
*Golden Age*, ii, 19, 21, 513.
*Golden Age Restored*, ii, 120.
*Golden Legend*, i, 29.
Golding, Arthur, i, 39, 392; ii, 446.
Goldingham, William, i, 38, 577; ii, 75.
Goldsmith, Oliver, i, xxxiii.
Gollancz, I., ii, 67.
Gomersall, Robert, i, 410; ii, 177.
Gondomar, Diego Sarmiento de Acuña, Marquis de, i, 27, 444.
Goodlet, J., i, 369.
Goodwin, G., i, 564.
Googe, Barnabe, ii, 139.
*Gorboduc*, i, xxxi, 84, 86, 87, 96, 97, 106, 181, 209, 230, 239, 255, 256, 265, 293, 426; ii, 4, 401, 403, 453.
Gosse, E., i, 419, 589; ii, 151.
*Gossips' Brawl*, ii, 303.
Gosson, Stephen, i, xxxviii, 82, 149, 150, 151, 209, 233, 291; ii, 21, 32, 461.
Gothein, Marie, i, 200, 371.
Gough, John, ii, 48, 359.
Goughe, Henry, ii, 11.
Goulart, Simon, ii, 237.
Gower, John, ii, 199.
Gowry, Earl of, i, 306, 307.
*Gowry's Conspiracy*, i, 252.
Grabau, C., i, 196.
Graf, H., i, 463.
Grafton, Richard, i, 250, 298.
Grassi, Giacomo di, i, 93.
*Grateful Servant*, ii, 313, 320, 322.
Gray, C. H., ii, 352, 355.
Grazzini, A. F., i, 196.
*Great Duke of Florence*, i, 408, 410, 452; ii, 232, 256, 308, 423, 532.
Great Yarmouth, the "playhouse" at, ii, 391.
Greek influence, i, 469.
*Greek Maid*, i, 118; ii, 145.
*Greeks and Trojans*, ii, 39.
Greene, Robert, i, xxiv, xxix, 41, 43, 178, 180, 204, 215, 229, 241, 266, 283, 428, 446; ii, 140, 161, 177, 178, 182, 190, 201, 204, 205; Bible plays of, 42; *Groatsworth of Wit* of, 189, 235, 271; plays of, 189, 192, 194, 200, 201, 221, 227, 228, 244, 245, 253, 259, 271; contrasted with other playwrights, 192; influeneed by romantic drama, 194; and the heroical romance, 200; and *Titus Andronicus*, 221; on Marlowe's "Atheism," 224; on Marlowe's death, 237; representative of the new romantic spirit in comedy, 242–244; imitative nature of the works of, 244, 245; his services to the drama, 245, 246; and the chronicle play, 259, 285, 286, 308; his part in the *Contentions*, 267; and 1 *Henry VI*, 267; his attitude toward Shakespeare, 271, 272; in the domestic drama, 319–321, 326; *Taming of a Shrew* ascribed to, 340; chronological relation of Shakespeare to, 378; use of magic by, 387; *James IV*, a source of *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, 392, 393; fairies of, 396; his *Planetomachia* the source of *The Costly Whore*, 439; *Tully's Love* of, used as a source, 472; cited in regard to satire in the drama, 474; and *Love's Labor's Lost*, 476; his humble birth, 523; not an actor; ii, 375; a writer for the Queen's Company, 377; contempt of, for non-academic writers, 378, 379; the romanticism of, 388; plays of, in Germany, 392; his heroical romance *Orlando*, 399,

406; dramatic rivalry of, with Marlowe in *Alphonsus* and *Friar Bacon*, 406; power of, in the representation of English rural life, 406, 407; success in romantic drama, 407; bibliography of, 462, 465, 467, 469, 470, 490, 493, 528.
Greene, Thomas, i, 497, 519.
Greenstreet, J., i, 116.
Greet, Ben, i, 164.
Greg, W. W., i, 241, 313, 588; ii, 128, etc., *passim*.
Gregory the Great, i, 2.
Grein, C. W. M., i, 48.
Gresham, Sir Thomas, i, 285, 288, ii, 402.
Greville, Sir Fulke, later Lord Brooke, i, xxxii, 99, 420, 446, 577; ii, 6–8, 49, 76; his tragedies of Oriental scene, 448; his destruction of a play on Anthony and Cleopatra, 573; his life, ii, 10; his association with the Sidneys and Pembrokes, 11; his intimacy with Daniel, 11; his *Alaham* and *Mustapha*, 11–14; his *Life of Sidney*, 11, 12; his theory of tragedy, 12–14; and Davenant, 340; his tragedies wholly academic and not intended for the stage, 388; bibliography of, 452, 496, 512, 513.
*Grey, Lady Jane*, i, 252, 287, 288; ii, 55.
*Grim, the Collier of Croydon*, i, 119, 310, 356, 498, 578.
Grimald, Nicholas, i, 36, 37, 39, 40, 87, 91, 198; ii, 154, 446.
Grimestone, Edward, i, 218, 424; ii, 11, 237, 494, 495.
Grimm, J. L., i, 392.
Grindal, Archbishop, i, 150.
Griselda, the story of, i, 50, 329.
*Griselidis, Estoire de*, i, 50.
*Grissil, Patient*. See *Patient Grissil*.
Grosart, A. B., i, 38, 98, etc., *passim*.
Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, i, 14, 46.
Grotius, Hugo, i, 44; ii, 394.
Groto, L., i, 208; ii, 76, 80, 144, 178.
Grumbine, H. C., i, 106.
*Guardian*, ii, 88, 255, 256, 304, 308.
Guarini, Giambattista, ii, 80, 139, 142, 143, 145, 156, 167, 175, 178, 179.
Guarna, Andrea, ii, 63.
Guazzo, Stephen, i, 93.
Guelphs, the, i, 409.
*Guelphs and Ghibbelines*, i, 442.
Guerra, Guido, i, 409.
Guicciardini, Francesco, i, 390, 410.
*Guido*, i, 409.
Guilds, their part in the performance of miracle plays, i, 14; of York, 15, 17; of Chester, 19; of Coventry, 20; and elsewhere, 22; fined for neglect of pageants in the Corpus Christi Plays, 23, 24.
Guise, François de Lorraine, Duke of, i, 411, 453.
*Guise*, i, 423.
*Guise, Duke of*, i, 423.
Gummere, F. B., i, 201.
Gunnell, R., i, 442; ii, 238, 262.
Guskar, H., i, 527.
Gustavus Adolphus, i, 453.
*Guy of Warwick*, i, 197, 208.
*Guy, Earl of Warwick*, ii, 360.
*Guzman de Alfarache*, ii, 213, 247.
Gwinne, Matthew, ii, 28, 72, 73, 76, 519.
Gwynn, Nell, ii, 342.
*Gypsies*, [*Anti*] *Masque of*, ii, 123, 127.
*Gypsies' Metamorphosis*. See *Gypsies*, [*Anti*] *Masque of*.

Habington, William, ii, 368, 374, 385.
Hacket, John, ii, 75, 81.
Haddington, John Ramsey, Viscount, *Masque* at the marriage of, ii, 108, 112.
*Hadriana*, i, 208.
Hales, J. W., i, 85, 87, 270.
Hall, Edward, i, 69, 75, 250; ii, 95, 96, 448.
Hall, Joseph, 483, 492.
Hallam, H., ii, 76.
Halliwell, Edward, i, 550; ii, 18, 56.
Halliwell-Phillipps, J. O., i, 142, 146, 182, etc., *passim*.
Halpin, N. J., i, 129, 130, 392.
*Hamlet* (of Kyd), i, 214–218, 246; ii, 68, 401, 408, 554–556; quartos of 1603 and 1604, i, 558–560; the folio, 560; (of Shakespeare in final form), i, xxv, xlii, 117, 172, 230, 275, 376, 383, 413, 436, 468, 489, 491, 559–562, 575, 576, 578, 580–582; ii, 19, 52, 69, 91, 220, 325, 335, 393, 407, 413, 428, 554; bibliography of, 464, 506, 509, 529.
Hamlet, the character and its influence, i, 543, 555, 566, 597; ii, 413.
Hampton, John, ii, 306.

*Handlyng Synne*, i, 14.
*Hannibal and Hermes*, ii, 21.
*Hannibal and Scipio*, ii, 21, 45, 280.
*Hans Beerpot*, ii, 256, 257.
"Happy ending," the, ii, 313.
*Hard Shift for Husbands*, ii, 238, 422.
*Hardicanute*, i, 253, 254.
Harding, Samuel, i, 410, 606; ii, 364.
Harington, i, 115, 200, 445; ii, 60.
Harriott, Thomas, i, 225.
*Harrowing of Hell*, i, 48.
*Harry of Cornwall*, i, 261.
Hart, J. M., i, 36.
Harvey, Gabriel, i, 124, 138, 224, 228, 237, 447, 474; ii, 60, 61, 502.
Haslewood, Joseph, i, 115, 137, 138, 167, 174, 219, 237, 445, 465.
Hatcher, O. L., i, 527; ii, 218, 250, 251.
Hathway, Richard, i, 252, 253, 278, 279, 347, 379, 388, 413, 429, 521.
Haughton, William, i, 119, 222, 223, 298, 347, 354, 356, 429, 500, 501, 562; ii, 153, 379.
Hausted, Peter, ii, 84, 87.
*Haveloc, Lay of*, i, 50.
Hawkesworth, Walter, ii, 62, 77.
Hawkins, F., i, 373.
Hawkins, J. S., i, 564.
Hawkins, William, ii, 83.
Hawkins, Captain William, of the Hector, ii, 393.
Hay, Lord, ii, 107, 112.
Hazlitt, W. C., i, 48, 71, 82, 141, 142, 147, etc., *passim*.
*Heautontimoroumenos*, i, 461.
Hearne, T., ii, 55.
*Hecatommithi*, i, 210, 331; ii, 208, 324.
Heckmann, T., ii, 231.
*Hector of Germany*, i, 398, 436–438; ii, 496.
*Hecuba*, i, 577.
"*Hegge plays*," i, 19, 51.
*Heir*, ii, 43, 239, 258, 259, 272.
*Hekastus*, ii, 450.
Heliodorus, ii, 48, 359, 517.
*Heliogabalus*, ii, 18.
*Helmet, Masque of the*, ii, 99.
Heming, John, i, 145, 182, 384; ii, 36, 243, 380.
Heming, William, i, 182, 183, 426, 427; ii, 35, 36, 364, 458.
*Hengist*, i, 296, 510.
Henrietta Maria, Queen, ii, 124, 130, 171, 173, 285, 329, 345, 346, 351; her players, 285, 310, 311, 385, 386.
Henry, Prince, and his players, i, 422, 495, 496; ii, 94, 110, 111, 114.
*Henry's Barriers, Speeches at Prince*, ii, 94, 111.
*Henry I, History of*, i, 304.
*Henry I and Henry II*, i, 304.
Henry II, i, 12.
Henry III of England, i, 438.
Henry III of France, i, 411, 415.
*Henry IV*, i, xxxvi, 72, 257, 273, 276, 278, 282, 324, 353; ii, 406, 478.
Henry IV of France, i, 416, 417, 421, 422, 440.
Henry V, i, 248, 252, 254, 281; ii, 406.
*Henry V, Famous Victories of*, i, xxviii, 188, 257, 261, 262, 281, 411; ii, 404.
*Henry V* (of Shakespeare), i, xxiv, xxxvi, 257, 273, 277, 278, 281; ii, 478.
Henry VI, i, 74, 188, 234; ii, 471, 472.
*Henry VI*, i, 247, 261, 263–265, 267, 271, 273, 358, 359, 411, 551; ii, 406, 471.
Henry VII, i, 249.
Henry VIII, i, xxiii, xxiv, xxvii, xxix, 31, 36, 55, 59, 64, 69, 70, 73, 76, 78, 81, 82, 86, 91, 93, 94, 100, 111, 139, 141, 195, 198, 247, 249, 287, 290, 406, 422; ii, 95, 129.
*Henry VIII* (of Shakespeare and Fletcher), i, 168, 273, 274, 287, 288, 290; ii, 69, 190, 229, 290, 337, 383, 412, 479, 480, 527; (of Wylley), i, 59, 85.
Henry, A., i, 538; ii, 277.
Henry of Almaine, i, 261, 438.
Henryson, R., i, 49.
Henslowe, John, i, 313.
Henslowe, Philip, i, xxv, xxxvi, 408, 411, 418, 422, 423, 431, 436, 445, 466; ii, 153, 154, 228, 234, 379, 381, 394, 434, 438 (and *Diary* cited *passim*); the Rose, his theatre, i, 155; Fortune theater built by, 156, 160; Ben Jonson engaged to write *Bartholomew Fair* for, 156; his inventories, 175–177, 179, 180; his playwrights given no interest in his playhouses, 184; character of, and of his *Diary*, 313–318; companies and theaters managed by, 317; domestic drama acted chiefly by companies of, 365; satirized in *Jack Drum's Entertainment*, 483; erects the Hope theater, 496; his quarrels with his company, ii, 241; his death, 242; bibliography of, 482.

*Heptameron of Civil Discourses*, i, 196, 210.
*Heraclius*, ii, 353.
Herbert, George, i, 44.
Herbert, Sir Henry, i, 43, 304, 342, 422, 431, 498, 527; ii, 169, 235, 243, 262, 268, 285, 291, 292, 295, 316, 317, 371, 385, 453, 532.
Herberts, the, ii, 232.
Hercules, plays on, ii, 20, 452, 512.
Herford, C. H., i, xxxi, 34, 36, 37, 39, 48, 60, 61, 65, 66, 83, and *passim*.
*Hermophus*, ii, 83.
*Hero and Leander*, i, 225, 230, 269, 272.
*Herod and Antipater*, i, 42, 550, 605; ii, 8, 35, 512, 516.
*Herodes* (of Adamson), i, 38; (of Goldingham), i, 38, 577; ii, 75.
Herodian, i, 426.
*Heroes, Masque of*, ii, 122.
Heroic element in the drama, ii, 190, 359, 360, 399, 402, 406, 426. See, also, *Heroic play*.
*Heroic Lover*, ii, 365.
Heroic play, ii, 184, 190, 343, 348–352, 536, 537.
Heroic verse, ii, 349, 351, 427.
*Herpetulus*, i, 198–199.
Herrick, Robert, ii, 269.
Hertford, Earl of, his players, i, 145.
Hertz, E., i, 144, 186, 217, 220.
Hesiod, i, 414.
*Hester, Godly Queen*, i, 38, 114, 119, 120.
*Hester and Ahasuerus*, i, 42.
Hewlett, M., i, 273.
*Hey for Honesty*, ii, 87.
Heylin, Peter, ii, 75, 81.
Heywood, Jasper, i, 97.
Heywood, John, i, 48, 61, 68, 90, 94, 203, 218, 310, 339, 345; ii, 137, 375; his farces, i, xxviii; raises the interlude to an independent dramatic form, 78–81; *Thersites* assigned to, 88, 89, 91, 92; his services to the drama, ii, 397; repudiates the didactic element in his farces, 397; his farces written for the circle of the court, 399; responsible for the step from medieval to modern drama, 400; bibliography of, 451.
Heywood, Thomas, i, 48, 194, 457, 499, 500, 509, 547; ii, 49, 137, 152, 171, 376, 392; his service in the representation of contemporary life, i, xxix; his dramatization of Ovid, xxxiv; *The Iron Age, Part II*, 178; *If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*, 178, 288, 289; mentioned by Henslowe, 180; *Apology for Actors*, 203, 218, 345; *Woman Killed with Kindness*, 204, 283, 340; in heroical comedy, 204, 205, 303, 304; *The Thracian Wonder*, 170, 204, 205; *Four Prentices of London*, 205, 206, 397, 404; his obligations to Fuller's *History of the Holy War*, 205; *King Edward IV*, 261, 281–283, 337, 397; plays on Queen Elizabeth, 288; plays on piracy, 292; and *Fortune by Land and Sea*, 292, 349; *Fair Maid of the West*, 292; Dick of Devonshire, attributed to, 293; *Royal King and Loyal Subject*, 303, 304; and the chronicle play, 307, 308; fecundity of, 310; influenced by connection with Henslowe, 318; compared with Marlowe and Shakespeare, 318; in domestic drama, 326, 335–338; the *Wise Woman* of, 335; life and work of, 335–338; *Yorkshire Tragedy* ascribed to, 347; *The Captives* of, 352; *History of Women* of, cited, 352, 353; *Apology for Actors* of, cited, 345, 355; use of witchcraft by, 359; and the *Late Lancashire Witches*, 362; domestic drama of, 366; chronological relation of Shakespeare to, 378; work of, 397; romantic comedy of, 397, 403, 404; mythology in, 397; chronicle history of, 397; *Five Plays in One* ascribed to, by Fleay, 401; his dramatized mythology, ii, 19–21; his *Rape of Lucrece*, 21, 27; his *Love's Mistress*, 95; and civic pageants, 128; his *Royal King and Loyal Subject*, 224; his *Captives*, 236; his later comedies, 262, 263; his bourgeois attempt in *The Challenge for Beauty* to imitate cavalier ideals, 309; fecundity of, as a playwright, 374; leaves the Admiral's men, 379; personal relations of, 381; obscurity of the life of, 381; journalistic fluency and carelessness of, 381; praised by Webster, 382; jocular couplets of, on contemporary playwrights, a pleasant proof of agreeable social relations; 382, 338; employed in civic pageants, 382; *The Hierarchie of Blessed Angels* by, quoted, 383; writes for the Princess

Elizabeth's players, 384; Plautine scenes in plays of, 401; degradation of heroical romance in *The Four Prentices* of, 406; domestic pathos of his *Edward IV*, 408; attempt of, to dramatize mythology, 409, 410; domestic comedies of, in the reign of James, 413; later romantic comedies of, 425; the attempt of, to emulate Fletcher in tragicomedy, 425; bibliography of, 478–481, 485, 513, 516, 531, 532.
*Hickscorner*, i, 56, 62; ii, 395, 450.
Higden, Ralph, i, 31, 298.
Higges, Griffin, ii, 73–75.
Hilarius, i, 8, 9; ii, 443.
Hill, H. W., i, 241.
Hirzel, R., i, 48, 61.
*Historia de Bello Africano*, i, 428.
*Histoira Histrionica*, ii, 122.
History, as a subject for drama, i, xxviii, 405, 453, 454, 552; plays on pseudo-historical themes, 284, 285, 293–296, 298–301; liberal Elizabethan interpretation of, 406; groups of plays on, 407; of Italy, 408–410; of France, 410–427; of Spain, 428–434; of Holland and Germany, 434, 443; of the Turks and other Eastern peoples, 445–451; bibliography of dramas based on, 470–481, 493–496.
*History of Error*, i, 119, 458.
*Histriomastix*, i, 479, 480, 484, 488, 542; ii, 173, 174, 502.
*Hock Tuesday Play*, i, 254; ii, 470.
*Hoffman*, i, 408, 411, 413, 436, 452, 453, 562–565; ii, 479, 507.
*Hog Hath Lost His Pearl*, i, 350, 437, 521, 522; ii, 184.
Hogarth, William, i, 508.
Hohlfeld, A., i, 13, 21, 51.
Hoker, John, ii, 54.
Holbein, Hans, i, 75.
Holiday, B., ii, 81.
Holinshed, Ralph, i, 75, 82, 250, 298, 300, 301, 344; ii, 71, 408, 477.
Holland, English players in, ii, 391.
*Holland's Leaguer*, ii, 275, 276.
*Hollander*, ii, 278, 279.
Hollstein, E., i, 357.
*Holophernes*, i, 37.
Holstein, the Duke of, ii, 104.
Holt, L. H. Jr., i, 533.
Holthausen, F., i, 31, 65, 81, 89.
Homer, ii, 20, 22, 286, 292, 414, 418.
*Homo*, ii, 75.
*Homulus*, ii, 450.
Hone, W., i, 12.
*Honest Excuses*, i, 150.
*Honest Lawyer*, i, 350.
*Honest Man's Fortune*, i, 528; ii, 228, 241, 505, 530.
*Honest Whore*, i, 177, 388, 339, 510; ii, 413, 484.
*Honneur des Dames*, i, 51.
*Honor and Riches*, ii, 137.
*Honor of Wales*, ii, 120.
*Honor of Women*, ii, 233.
*Honor's Academy*, ii, 178.
Hooker, John, i, 83.
Hoopes, E. S., i, 68.
Hope theater, the, i, 153, 156, 159–160, 496; ii, 242.
Horace, i, xxxiii, 469, 537, 539; ii, 55.
*Horestes*, i, 118, 120; ii, 45, 402, 513.
Houghton, William, i, 521.
Housekeepers, playhouses owned by, i, 182–184; Shakespeare's company managed by, 317.
*How a Man May Choose a Good Wife from a Bad*, i, 330–334; ii, 484.
Howard, Lord Charles, his players, i, 144.
Howard, Sir Robert, i, 430; ii, 362.
Howe, F. A., i, 296.
Howell, James, ii, 131, 347.
Hudson, J. H., i, 581.
*Hue and Cry after Cupid*, ii, 108, 112.
Hughes, Thomas, i, 97, 105, 106, 109, 225, 255, 256, 265, 293, 549; ii, 3, 4, 15, 374, 453.
Humanism and the humanists, i, 33–35. 41, 67, 81, 91, 92, 94; ii, 394, 395, 400, 446, 449, 485, 511.
*Humers, Comedy of*, i, 460.
"Humor," the, i, 278, 310, 311, 323, 339, 460, 470, 471; ii, 265–267.
*Humor out of Breath*, i, 168, 169, 397; ii, 152, 158, 415.
*Humorous Courtier*, ii, 313–315.
*Humorous Day's Mirth*, i, 460, 464.
*Humorous Lieutenant*, ii, 24, 38, 39, 205.
*Humors Reconciled*. See *Magnetic Lady*.
Humphrey, Duke, i, 263.
*Humphrey, Duke*, i, 307.
*Hungarian Lyon*, i, 442.
Hunning, William, i, 124.
Hunnis, William, i, 112–115, 118, 122, 186, 187, 255, 256; ii, 98, 374, 375, 455.

Hunsdon, Henry Carey, Lord, his players, i, 144, 145.
*Hunting of Cupid*, i, 135; ii, 147.
Huntingdon, Earl of, Masque for the, at Ashby, ii, 107.
*Huntington, Robert, Earl of*, i, 279, 280; ii, 154, 479.
*Huon of Bordeaux*, i, 203, 392, 393.
*Huss, John, Burning of*, i, 72,
*Hyde Park*, ii, 290, 291, 296, 428.
Hyginus, C. J., i, 132.
*Hymenæi*, ii, 105, 106.
*Hymenæus*, i, 196, 197, 456; ii, 77.
*Hymen's Holiday*, i, 422.
*Hymen's Masque* in *As You Like It*, ii, 129.
*Hymen's Triumph*, ii, 163, 167, 168, 172, 174, 412, 525.
"*Hypolitus*," ii, 3.

Ibsen, Henrik, i, xliii.
*Ieronomo*, i, 219, 428, 452; ii, 464.
*If This be not a Good Play, the Devil is in It*, i, 355, 538.
*If You Know Not Me You Know Nobody*, i, 178, 285, 288, 289, 429, 500; ii, 412, 480.
*Ignoramus*, i, xxxi, 77–79, 81; ii, 123, 401.
*Ill Beginning has a Good End*, ii, 328.
*Ill Beginning Makes a Bad End*, i, 333.
*Ilustre Fregona*, ii, 206.
Imelmann, R., i, 39, 209.
*Imperial Tragedy*, ii, 365.
*Imperiale*, ii, 364, 402, 537.
*Imposture*, ii, 322.
*Inconstant*, ii, 247.
*Inconstant Lady*, ii, 338, 339, 427.
*Ingannanti*, i, 197, 456; ii, 77, 92.
Ingeland, Thomas, i, 64, 65, 81.
Ingleby, C. M., ii, 375.
Ingram, J. H., i, 225, 235, 236, 238.
*Inner Temple and Gray's Inn Masque* (by Beaumont), i, 524; ii, 116, 129, 185; (by Brown), see *Ulysses and Circe;* (by Middleton), see *Heroes, Masque of.*
Innocent III, Pope, i, 14.
Inns of court, plays of the, i, 139, 185.
Inn-yards employed as theaters, i, xxvi, 153, 157–159.
*Insatiate Countess*, i, 542, 585, 586, 594; ii, 413, 414, 501, 509.
"In-scenes," i, 165, 166.
Interlude, the biblical, i, 43; a true dramatic form, 73, 78; a function of, 76; definition of the, 77, 78; of John Heywood, 78–81, 94; and the spirit of romance, 89, 90; the vernacular, 92; *Jack Straw*, an historical, 257; familiar humorous types inserted in the, 310; satire in the, 474.
*Interludium de Clerico et Puella*, i, 49, 50; ii, 448.
"Intermeans" in Jonson's late comedies, ii, 265, 266.
*Introit* of the Mass, the, i, 3, 5, 7.
*Iphigenia*, i, 118, 550; ii, 2, 3, 59.
*Ira seu Tumulus Fortunæ*, device at Oxford, ii, 74.
Ireland, Shirley takes Elizabethan drama to, ii, 285, 286.
*Irish Knight*, i, 118.
*Irish Masque*, ii, 118.
*Irish Rebellion*, i, 306.
*Iron Age*, i, 178; ii, 20, 513.
*Isaac and Jacob*, ii, 43.
*Island Princess*, i, 429, 430; ii, 211, 215, 530.
Isle of Devils, ii, 202.
*Isle of Dogs*, i, 138; ii, 67.
*Isle of Gulls*, i, 140, 397, 445; ii, 152, 158, 314, 415.
Italian influence in the drama, i, xxix, xxx, 203, 208–211, 239, 248, 259, 309, 341, 369, 374, 378, 382, 386, 387, 398, 401, 403, 408–410, 307, 454; 456 (and *passim* in ch. x); ii, 77, 78, 139, 462, 486–488, 493, 494, 511, 524, 525.
*Italian Nightpiece*, ii, 234.
*Italian Tragedy*, i, 562.
Iver, *Printemps* of, 11, 214.

*Jack and Gill*, i, 119.
*Jack Drum's Entertainment*, i, 398, 413, 482–484, 486, 488, 489, 542; ii, 502.
*Jack Straw, Life and Death of*, i, xx, 136, 257, 258, 261, 280; ii, 406, 471.
*Jack Wilton*, i, 138.
*Jacke Juggler*, i, 83.
*Jacob and Esau*, i, 40, 41, 43, 87, 88; ii, 393, 394.
Jacob, T. E., i, 286.
Jacobs, J., ii, 131, 224.
Jaques, Francis, i, 427.
James I, i, xxiv, xxxii, 19, 27, 43, 179, 211, 252, 254, 285, 306, 307, 353, 359, 381, 383, 441, 443–445, 506; ii, 10, 11, 14, 52, 71, 73, 78, 79, 101, 119, 120, 123, 124, 158, 164, 166, 411, 419; his

company of players, i, 145, 169, 182, 304, 307, 358, 383, 389, 390, 495; ii, 122, 190, 242, 243, 310, 380, 383.
James IV, of Scotland, i, 253.
*James IV, Scottish History of King*, i, 244, 245, 253, 259, 378, 392, 393; ii, 182, 407, 469, 478, 493.
James V, of Scotland, i, 70.
James, Henry, i, 468.
Jastrow, M., i, 373.
*Jealous Lovers*, ii, 85, 86.
Jealousy as a Shakespearean theme, i, 575.
*Jephtha*, i, 42, 550.
*Jephthes* (by Buchanan), i, 34, 37, 91; ii, 54, 446; (by Christopherson), 37.
*Jeronimo*. See *Ieronimo*.
Jerusalem, the destruction of, as a dramatic theme, i, 26, 27.
*Jerusalem*, i, 203.
Jew, the, in Elizabethan drama, i, 209, 232, 233, 372–374; ii, 490.
*Jew*, i, 209.
*Jew of Malta*, i, xxvi, 232, 233, 268, 372, 447, 569; ii, 19, 467, 489.
Jewell, John, i, 358.
*Jeweller of Amsterdam*, i, 441.
*Jewish Gentleman*, ii, 269, 270.
*Jews' Tragedy*, ii, 35, 36.
Joan of Arc, i, 359, 411.
*Job's Sufferings*, i, 35, 37.
*Jocasta*, i, 97, 104, 163, 177, 209, 230, 265, 401, 426; ii, 2, 453.
Jodelle, Etienne, ii, 6, 340, 467.
*Johan Baptistes*, i, 33, 43, 59; ii, 393, 446.
*Johan, King*, i, 59, 70, 71, 91, 254, 255.
John, King, i, 170, 234, 252, 280.
*John, King*, i, 258, 273, 305; ii, 471.
*John, King, and Matilda*, i, 280, 304, 305, 598; ii, 258–260, 424, 481, 533.
*John a Kent and John a Cumber*, i, 176, 284, 388, 389; ii, 409, 479, 493.
John of Gaunt, i, 252.
*John of Gaunt, Conquest of Spain by*, i, 252.
*John, Troublesome Reign of*, i, 257, 258, 261, 262.
*John the Baptist*, i, 44, 446.
*John the Husband, Tib his Wife, and Sir John the Priest*, i, 80, 81, 119.
Johnson, Laurence, i, 87; ii, 451.
Johnson, Samuel, i, 290; ii, 76.
Johnson, William, ii, 84.
Johnson, W. S., i, 537.
*Jonas*, i, 35.
Jones, H. A., i, 329.
Jones, Inigo, ii, 98, 158; his ingenuity in varying scenes, i, 172; influence of his stage-craft on the popular drama, 179; takes the step from medieval to modern pictorial stage setting, ii, 72; his part in *Vertumnus*, 73, 74; his scenic devices in the *Masque of Blackness*, 105, 107, 111; payment for the device of *Love Freed from Ignorance*, 112; retires to Italy, 114; his part in Campion's Lords' Masque, 115; becomes surveyor of the king's works, 122; his quarrel with Jonson, 122, 123; his genius in scenic effect and contrivance, 126; last masques with Jonson, 130; Jonson's inveterate quarrel with, 130, 131, 264, 267, 268, 381; his ingenuity in later masques, 131, 132; his devices for *Luminalia*, 136; association of Jonson with, in the masque, 381; his development of the scenery, costume, and other setting of the masque, 411.
Jonson, Ben, i, xxv, xxxv–xxxvii, xl, xli, 117, 414, 418, 420, 453, 492, 493, 504, 508, 509, 515, 519, 520, 523, 524, 526, 545, 547; ii, 77, 207, 254, 277, 292, 296, 301, 304, 307, 310, 336, 337, 340, 360, 377, 389, 407, 420, 421, 423, 424; and the school of conscious effort, i, xxxii, xxxiii; the scholarly classical tragedies of, xxxiii; the dramatic satires of, xxxiii; importance historically of his *Every Man in His Humor*, xxxiii; and the Office of the Revels, 102; his obligations to Lyly, 133, 134, 140; *Bartholomew Fair*, 156, 222; *Poetaster*, 167, 177; *The Alchemist*, 168, 170, 206; *Cynthia's Revels*, 172, 173; *The Case is Altered*, 176, 380; and simultaneous scenery, 178, 179; his sense for historical anachronism, 181; and the popular stage, 187; low life depicted by, 193, 278; *Epicœne*, 206; his additions to Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy*, 211; *Richard Crookback*, 281; *The Sad Shepherd*, 284, 360, 395; his part in *Mortimer*, 306; prices paid, 316, 317; compared with Shakespeare, 318; changes names and settings in *Every Man in His Humor*, 325; the *Tale of a Tub*, the single domestic drama of, 326; influence of, 327, 349; relations of Shakespeare and, 342;

collaboration on *Page of Plymouth*, 346; given over to the comedy of manners in the reign of James, 351; the *Devil is an Ass* of, 357, 358; use of witchcraft by, 359; the *Sad Shepherd* of, 360; the supernatural in, 365; domestic drama of, 366; *Every Man in his Humor* of, 368; Shakespeare's relations with, 368; fairies of, 395, 396, 403; Shakespeare compared with, 395; influence of, towards satire, 400; relation of, to romantic comedy, 403; in comedy of manners, 404; his character Sejanus and Hamlet compared, 413; his hand in *The Bloody Brother*, 425, 426; and the comedy of manners, 456, 465–471; use of Plautus, 457; compared with Shakespeare, 459; and the *Comedey of Humers*, 460; relation of Chapman to, 460, 464; details of the life of, 465–466; importance of *Every Man in His Humor*, 467; his comedy, 467–469; contrasted with Shakespeare as regards his portrayal of character, 468–471; classical theories of, 469; use of "humors," 470, 471; imitation of, 471; Field taught by, 473; and the "war of the theaters," 473, 477–491; standing of, in 1598, 478; nature of the satire of, 487; writes *Bartholomew Fair* for the new Hope, 496; his collaboration in *Eastward Hoe*, 505, 506; imprisoned for the satire of that play, 507; released by the influence of D'Aubigny, 507; his great comedies, 529–542; his view of life in his comedies, 534; his attitude contrasted with that of Shakespeare, 535, 536; ingenuity of the plot construction of, 535, 536; his use of material, 536–542; his learning and employment of it, 537; his draughts on the classics, 538; alleged Shakespearean borrowings, 539, 540; and Giordano Bruno, 540–542; his want of French and Italian, 541; the variety of his fools, 547; his *Sejanus*, 550; his additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, 557; his development of the character, Hieronimo, 557; his rivalry of Shakespeare's re-written *Hamlet* in the additions, 558; his scholarly picturing of the life of the ancients, 574, 577; the Senecan ghost in his *Catiline*, 577, 594; *Dido and Æneas* ascribed to, ii, 18, 19; his *Sejanus*, 24–27, 32, 33; relations of with Shakespeare, 25, 70; his dramatic portraiture, 25, 33; his display of classical learning, 26, 27, 28, 33; his *Catiline*, 26, 32, 33, 414; fidelity to history in his classical plays, 33; in classical tragedy, 33–34; commends Cartwright, 46, 49, 50; his *Volpone* acted at the universities, 52; estimate of, in *The Return from Parnassus*, 69; taunted with bricklaying, 69; his contact with the universities, 91; his honorary degrees, 91; and the masque, 93–95; his *Panegyre* on James' first Parliament, 101; his *Entertainment at Althorpe*, 101, 102; the anti-masque presaged, 102; his activity as a deviser of masques at court, 103; masque at Coleorton attributed to him, 103; his *Masque of Blackness*, 104, 105; his *Masque of Beauty*, 108; his *Masque of Queens*, 108; its anti-masque, 108; his rivalry of Daniel, 110; cost of his masques, 112, 113; his honorarium for *Love Freed from Ignorance*, 112; his masques of 1610–13, 113; leaves the court for France, 115; returns to his post as entertainer of the court, 118; his masques of 1615–18, 119; his quarrel with Inigo Jones, 122, 123; his journey afoot to Scotland, 123; rewarded for the *Masque of Gypsies*, 123; renewed activity in the, after his return from Scotland, 123; his last Jacobean masques, 123, 124; his opinion of allegory and allusion, 125; his classical learning in the, 126; his employment of the supernatural, and of satire in the masque, 127; of humor and drollery, 127; last years of, 130; his quarrel with Jones renewed, 130; his entertainments of the king at Welbeck and Bolsover, 131; his part in the pastoral, 146, 154, 156; his *Sad Shepherd*, 166–169, 180; his rivalry of Daniel in the pastoral, 167; the comedy of, as a type, 240, constructive excellence of the comedy of, 240; his activity in later comedies of manners, 244; last dramas of, 263–267; his quarrel with Jones inveterate, 264, 267, 268; his library destroyed by fire, 264; loss of a patron in King James, 264; his decaying powers, 267; last days of, 267,

268; chronologer of London, 267, 268; kindness of King Charles to, 267, 268; failure of the reversion of the Mastership of the Revels to, 267, 268; death of, 268; tributes to the memory of, 268; second folio of the works of, 268; influence of, on his contemporaries, 268, 269; personal relations of, 268; collaboration of, 268; his *Underwoods*, 282; popularity of the plays of, in Charles' reign, 308; his ridicule of Platonic love, 347, 351; apocryphal tradition that he was an actor, 376; leaves the Admiral's men for killing Gabriel Spenser, 379; joins the company of Shakespeare, 380; writes for the Chapel Children, 380; Shakespeare's recommendation of, 380; Shakespeare's friendship for, 380; visit of, to Shakespeare, 380; a cultivator of "great ones," 380; friends and patrons of, 381; intimate of Marston and Chapman, 381; enemies and butts of the ridicule of, 381; "sons" of, 381; association of, with Jones in the masque, 381; access of, to court and gentle society, 381; praised by Webster, 382; Heywood's couplet on, 383; the sovereign of literary Bohemia, 385; occasional literary extravagance of, 388; Plautine plots and personages in, 400; romantic elements in *The Case is Altered* of, 409; *versus* Shakespeare in dramatized classical history, 410; the comedy of humors and dramatic satire in the hands of, 410; war of the theaters, 410; his revision of *The Spanish Tragedy*, 411; his development of the masque to its artistic height, 411; success of, in the pastoral fragment, *The Sad Shepherd*, 412; his *Catiline*, 414; his acceptance of English scene for comedy, 415; his great comedies, 415; *Volpone*, a study in villainy, 415; self-consciousness of the comedies of, 415; effect of the comedy of, on later writers, 416; the dominating dramatic influence of the first decade of James, 418; a Jacobean, 418; turns from the popular stage to the masque at court, 418; struggle of, against the tastes of his age, 419; return of, to satire, allegory, and "humors," 425; persistence of the influence of the earlier comedy of, on his successors, 425, 426; bibliography of, 479, 486, 493, 497–502, 522, 525, 526.

Jonson, Junior, Ben, ii, 261, 262, 269.

*Jonsonus Virbius*, ii, 176, 268.

Jordan, Thomas, ii, 303.

Josephus, Flavius, i, 410; ii, 36, 218.

*Joshua*, i, 42.

Journalism in the drama, i, 105, 106, 288, 289, 292, 369, 370.

*Jovial Crew*, ii, 274, 275, 425.

*Judas*, i, 42.

*Judge*, ii, 233.

*Judicium*, i, 18.

*Jugurtha*, ii, 21.

*Julia Agrippina*, ii, 44.

*Julian Apostata*, ii, 18.

*Julian the Apostate*, ii, 82.

Juliet, i, 571, 572.

Julius Cæsar, plays on, i, 550; ii, 21–24, 27, 92, 514.

*Julius Cæsar* (of Shakespeare), i, xxv, 180, 407, 414, 552, 569, 573, 577, 580; ii, 6, 21–24, 26, 29, 49, 312, 514, 515; (of Alexander), ii, 14; (of Geddes), 17, 21; (of May), 22, 45, 81.

*Julius Cæsar, The Revenge of*, ii, 23.

*Julius Cæsar, The Tragedy of*, ii, 23.

*Julyus Sesar*, ii, 17, 21.

Jusserand, J. J., i, 23, 30, 49, 51.

*Just General*, ii, 368.

*Just Italian*, ii, 300, 341.

Juvenal, i, xxxiii, 492, 538.

Kamen, P., i, 17.

Katherine of Aragon, i, 74.

Keeling, Captain William, ii, 393.

Keller, W., i, 227, 398; ii, 18, 92.

Kelly, J. Fitzmaurice, i, 206.

Kelly, W., ii, 390, 391.

Kemp, William, i, 76, 144, 186, 255, 489; ii, 67–69, 92, 458.

Kenilworth, entertainment at, i, 254, 391; ii, 97, 403.

Ker, W. P., ii, 261.

Kett, Francis, i, 234, 235, 238.

Kildare, Earl of, ii, 285.

Kilian, E., i, 165, 166.

Killigrew, Henry, i, 606; *The Conspiracy* of, ii, 358.

Killigrew, Thomas, ii, 300, 374, 385; patent to, for the creation of a company of players, 299; degradation of comedy in *The Parson's Wedding* of, 302; pre-Restoration tragicomedies

of, 356, 357; folio of his works, 357; romances of, intermediary between Fletcher and the heroic drama, 427, 428; bibliography of, 537.
Killigrew, Sir William, his tragicomedies acted after the Restoration, ii, 358, 365.
King, the lecherous, as a stock figure, i, 596.
*King Freewill*, i, 44, 60.
*King Johan*, i, 406; ii, 403, 470, 477.
*King John and Matilda*. See *John, King, and Matilda*.
*King Lear*, i, 230, 253, 294, 295, 298–300, 551, 573, 575, 576, 591; ii, 32, 179, 413, 480.
*King Leir*, i, 253, 294, 295, 300, 378, 409.
*King Lud*, i, 298.
*King of Scots*, i, 114, 255, 306; ii, 403.
*King Robert of Sicily*, i, 50, 406.
*King Sebastian of Portugal*, i, 431.
King's players. See *James I*, his players.
King's Revels. See *James I*, his players.
*King and No King*, ii, 37, 183, 193, 195–197, 417, 422.
Kingsley, C., ii, 293.
Kinwelmersche, Francis, i, 104, 265.
Kipling, R., ii, 182, 183.
Kirchmayer, Thomas, i, 39, 59, 60.
Kirke, John, i, 197, 208, 258, 306, 426; ii, 318, 360.
Kirkman, Francis, i, 81, 336.
Kittredge, G. L., i, 87, 114, 121, 199, 352, 463.
Klein, J. L., i, 208; ii, 205.
*Knack to Know a Knave, A*, i, 255, 294, 356, 379, 380, 475; ii, 232.
*Knave in Grain*, ii, 303.
*Knave in Print*, ii, 263.
Knevet, Ralph, ii, 171, 172, 179.
*Knight of Malta*, ii, 220–223, 350, 425, 530.
*Knight of the Burning Rock*, i, 118, 199.
*Knight of the Burning Pestle*, i, 202, 206, 207, 213, 215, 525, 579; ii, 462, 463.
Knight, C., i, 494.
Knight-errantry, ii, 399, 402.
Knolles, Richard, i, 446, 449; ii, 11, 496.
Knowles, Lord, ii, 118.
Knowles, Sheridan, i, xlii.
Koeppel, E., i, 563; ii, 43, 208, 220, 233, 292, 330, 331, 333.
Körting, H., ii, 346.
Kramer, M., i, 20.
Kyd, Francis, i, 213.
Kyd, Thomas, i, xxiv, xxx, xxxii, 122, 137, 141, 192, 266, 281, 406, 407, 428, 446; ii, 2, 3, 7, 16, 49; *Spanish Tragedy*, i, 98, 210–214, 229, 230, 239, 246; his influence on Shakespeare, 140; and *Ieronimo*, 213, 214, 219; *Hamlet*, 214–218; *Soliman and Perseda*, 201, 214, 219; and *Titus and Andronicus*, 219, 221; his translations, 223; his relations to Marlowe, i, 223, 224, 234, 236; his *Letter to Sir John Puckering*, i, 223, 224, 235; his revolt from classic conventions, 239; his influence on the popular stage, 245; his influence on the drama, 246; *Taming of a Shrew*, ascribed to, 340; and the authorship of *Arden*, 345, 366; his humble birth, 523; sets the type of the tragedy of revenge in his *Spanish Tragedy*, 553–556; his translation of *Cornelie*, ii, 6, 8; his projected translation of *Porcie*, 8; not an actor, 375; his touch with the Pembroke circle, 375; an author for Strange's and Pembroke's companies, 377, 378; not of the university circle, 378; the romanticism of, 388; plays of, in Germany, 392; his *Cornelia*, Seneca by way of France, 401; *The Spanish Tragedy* of, Seneca popularized, 401; effective situation and vitalized personages the contribution of, to the drama, 405; bibliography of, 463–465, 512.
Kynaston, Edward, i, 185.
Kynder, Philip, ii, 170.

*Labyrinthus*, ii, 77.
Lacey, Henry, i, 281.
*Ladies' Privilege*, ii, 344, 345.
*Lady Alimony*, ii, 347.
*Lady Errant*, ii, 46, 47, 219, 366.
*Lady Jane Grey*, i, 288, 587.
*Lady Mother*, ii, 278, 295, 533.
*Lady of May*, ii, 98, 145, 403, 525.
*Lady of Pleasure*, ii, 294, 296.
*Lady's Trial*, ii, 297, 299, 327.
*Lælia*, i, 197, 374, 456; ii, 77, 92, 491.
Laidler, J., ii, 170.
Laing, D., i, 150.
Lamb, Charles, i, 305, 323, 338, 339, 501, 589.
*Lamentatio Rachel*, i, 7.
Lancaster, the royal house of, i, xxiv; ii, 477.

Lancaster, John, i, 105–106.
*Landgartha, Queen*, i, 442.
Lane, Sir Robert, his players, i, 144.
Lang, A., ii, 141.
Langbaine, Gerald, i, 203, 331, 356; ii, 41, 213, 292, 319, 358, 361, 365.
Lange, F., i, 297, 329.
Langland, William, i, 492.
Langley, Francis, i, 155.
*Lansdowne MS.*, i, 102, 296.
*Larum for London*, i, 405, 435, 452; ii, 496.
*Lascivious Queen*, ii, 406.
*Late Lancashire Witches*, i, 363, 364; ii, 262.
*Late Murder of the Son upon the Mother*, i, 349.
Lateware, Richard, ii, 10.
Latin plays, i, 34–38, 81–84, 86, 91, 281, 296; ii, 400, 401, 449, 517, 518.
Latin sources and influence, i, 309, 370, 374, 380, 392, 398, 404, 414, 454, 456 (and *passim* in ch. x); ii, 496, 497, 513. See, also, *Classical influence*.
Laud, William, Archbishop of Canterbury, ii, 88, 89.
Laurence, W. J., i, 162.
*Law Tricks*, i, 397, 545.
Lawes, William, ii, 132, 133.
*Laws of Candy*, ii, 226, 227, 309, 350, 425.
Leach, A. F., i, 31, 53.
*Leander*, ii, 77.
*Lear*. See *King Lear*.
Lee, M. L., i, 82; ii, 54, 70, 81.
Lee, S. L., i, 142, 143, 162, 185, 233, 370, 476, 493, 494; ii, 31, 198, 199, 202, 213, 229, 380, 411 (and *passim*).
Legend, as a source for the drama, i, 10, 197, 249, 251, 254, 293–297, 397.
Legge, Thomas, i, 84, 97, 255, 281; ii, 59, 63.
Lehman, E., i, 415.
Leicester, Robert Dudley, Earl of, i, 103, 114, 129, 131, 289, 391; ii, 4, 59, 97, 403; his players, i, 143, 144, 147, 154.
Leith, i, 348.
Leland, John, ii, 72.
*Lenten Stuff*, i, 138, 203.
*Leo Armenus*, ii, 84.
Leonatus Posthumus, i, 575.
Leonhardt, B., i, 206.
Lepanto, the battle of, i, 446.
Lessing, G. E., i, 333.
Lester, J. A., ii, 5.
Leune, William de, ii, 54.
*Lewis XI, History of*, i, 427.
Libanius, i, 538.
*Liberality and Prodigality*, ii, 402.
*Libero Arbitrio*, i, 60.
Liebau, G., i, 273.
*Like Will to Like*, i, 68, 310; ii, 397.
Lily, William, ii, 63.
Lincoln's Inn Fields, projected theater in, ii, 369.
*Lingua*, ii, 64, 70–72, 519.
*Little French Lawyer*, ii, 246, 247.
*Little Musgrave*, i, 337.
Littledale, H., ii, 129.
Liturgical drama. See *Sacred drama*.
*Locrine*, i, 98, 136, 253, 255, 256, 293, 578; ii, 404, 405, 471.
Lodge, Thomas, i, 216; ii, 140, 150, 155, 178; and the *Looking Glass for London and England*, i, 41, 43, 180, 241, 244, 266, 499; *Honest Excuses*, 150; *Defence of Poetry, Music, and Stage Plays*, 150, 151; on Kyd's *Hamlet*, 217; and *Mucedorus*, 240; *The Wounds of Civil War*, 241; but little known of him, 141, 142; *Rosalynd*, 242; his collaboration in early chronicle plays, 267; *True Tragedy of Richard III*, 281; and *King Lear*, 294; and the *Warning for Fair Women*, 346; *Rosalynd* of, adapted by Shakespeare, 375; satirized by Jonson, 482; his allusion to the earlier *Hamlet* in his *Wit's Misery*, 554; his *Wounds of Civil War*, ii, 16, 17; his *Defence of Plays*, 32; identified with Philomusus of *The Return from Parnassus*, 67; ashamed of his converse with the stage, 375; probably not an actor, 375; transfer of, from company to company as writer, 377; perhaps a writer for Shakespeare's company, 378; *Mucedorus* probably his, 407; bibliography of, 416, 468, 469, 490.
*Lodowick Sforza*, i, 410.
Loening, R., i, 559.
Logan, W., ii, 132, 302, 340.
Logeman, H., i, 4, 57.
*Loiola*, ii, 75, 81.
London, i, xxvi, 151, 152; ii, 458.
*London Chanticleers*, i, 499; ii, 302, 303.
*London Maid*, i, 499.
*London Merchant*, i, 499.

*London Prodigal*, i, 330, 333, 499; ii, 265, 396, 484.
*Long Meg of Westminster*, i, 499, 513, 522.
*Longbeard*, i, 253.
Longfellow, H. W., i, 172, 321.
*Longshanke*, i, 261, 262.
*Look About You*, i, 279, 283, 504; ii, 409.
Lope de Vega. See *Vega*.
*Lord Gouvernaunce*, i, 69.
Lord of Misrule, i, 76, 77, 100; ii, 73.
*Lords and Ladies of London*, ii, 404, 450.
*Lords' Masque*, ii, 115.
*Lost Lady*, i, 579; ii, 367, 368, 537.
Love in *Romeo and Juliet*, and later plays, ii, 422.
*Love*, i, 79; ii, 451.
*Love and Friendship*, ii, 358.
*Love and Honor*, ii, 342–345, 348, 349, 426.
*Love Crowns the End*, ii, 172.
*Love Freed from Ignorance*, ii, 112, 113, 122.
*Love in a Maze*, ii, 129.
*Love in its Ecstasy*, ii, 171.
*Love of a Grecian Lady*, i, 379.
*Love of an English Lady*, i, 379.
*Love Prevented*, i, 322.
*Love Restored*, ii, 113, 127.
*Love Tricks*, ii, 169, 286, 287.
*Love's Convert*, ii, 47.
*Love's Cruelty*, ii, 296, 322–324.
*Love's Cure*, i, 401, 402; ii, 214, 215.
*Love's Hospital*, ii, 84.
*Love's Labour's Lost*, i, 230, 239, 369, 370, 377, 384, 411, 476; ii, 129, 407, 489, 491.
*Love's Labour's Won*, i, 340, 372, 382; ii, 486.
*Love's Labyrinth*, ii, 176–178.
*Love's Metamorphosis*, i, 387; ii, 149, 150, 412.
*Love's Mistress*, ii, 95, 137, 171.
*Love's Pilgrimage*, ii, 206, 207.
*Love's Riddle*, ii, 88, 176.
*Love's Sacrifice*, ii, 329, 330, 335.
*Love's Triumph through Callipolis*, ii, 130.
*Love's Victory*, ii, 170.
*Love's Welcome* (to Bolsover), ii, 131; (to Welbeck), ii, 131.
Lovelace, Richard, his lost dramas, ii, 361, 374.
*Lover's Melancholy*, ii, 328, 329.
*Lovers Made Men*, ii, 120.
*Lovers of Ludgate*, i, 499.
*Lovers' Progress*, ii, 226, 227, 231, 350.
*Lovesick Court*, ii, 336.
*Lovesick King*, i, 284.
*Lovesick Maid*, ii, 270.
Low life pictured, i, 193, 278, 311.
Lower, Sir William, i, 606; ii, 358, 426, 536.
Lowin, John, i, xxvi; ii, 243.
Lownes, Matthew, ii, 208.
*Loyal Subject*, ii, 220, 309, 425.
Loyalty a favorite theme with Fletcher, ii, 223, 224.
*Loyalty and Beauty*, i, 115, 118.
Lucan, i, 213; ii, 42, 43, 137.
Luce, A., ii, 6.
Lucian, i, 83, 485, 534; ii, 193, 500.
*Lucre, Play of*, ii, 450.
*Lucrece*, i, 271, 272, 367.
*Lucrece, a Play concerning*, ii, 28, 513.
*Lucretia*, fragment of a "play concerning," i, 55.
"*Ludus Coventriae*," i, 15, 17, 19–22, 31, 51.
*Ludus de Kyng Robert of Cesill*, i, 50.
*Ludus Filiorum Israelis*, ii, 54.
*Luminalia*, ii, 136.
Lumly, J. R., i, 82.
Lumley, Lady Jane, ii, 2.
Lupton, Thomas, i, 68; ii, 402.
*Lust's Dominion*, i, 222, 223, 234, 428, 434, 585.
*Lusty Juventus*, i, 62.
Luther, Martin, i, 406; ii, 395.
Lydgate, John, i, 31, 74, 76, 385; ii, 20, 97, 448.
Lyly, John, i, xxiv, xxix, xxx, xxxvi, 94, 121–135, 137, 140, 408, 569; ii, 4, 16, 18, 19, 137, 151, 152, 375; sought for the Mastership of the Revels, i, 102; dialogue in his plays, 105; *Mother Bombie*, 109, 127–128, 132, 359; *Gallathea*, 109, 124, 128, 132; *Love's Metamorphosis*, 109, 125, 127, 128, 132; *Endimion*, 109; *Midas*, 109, 124, 127–132, 135, 240, 386, 387, 396; *The Woman in the Moon*, 110, 125, 128, 132; influenced by Edwards, 113; early plays acted by St. Paul's boys, 115; *Euphues*, 123, 130; *Campaspe*, 123, 124, 127, 128, 130, 132, 240; *Sapho and Phao*, 124, 127, 130, 132, 135, 179; his alleged post in the

Revels, 124; his activity in the Marprelate controversy, 124; *Pap with a Hatchet*, 125; his anti-Martinist plays, 125; his disappointment of the Mastership of the Revels, 125; euphuism, 126, 127, 130; *Entertainments* by, 129; his sources, 131, 132; his influence on the court drama, 133, 134; his influence on the drama, 139, 246; some plays arranged for classical staging, 163; not associated with the popular stage, 187; first artistic dramas in England by, 193; Italian influence on, 211; his influence on other playwrights, 240; romantic drama of, 369; Shakespeare's debt to, 369, 370, 391; supernatural in, 386, 387; fairies of, 393, 396; influence of, in romantic comedy, 392, 397, 403; Chapman and, 464; and the Marprelate controversy, 475; and *Love's Labour's Lost*, 476; not concerned in *Bellum Grammaticale*, or in *Rivales*, ii, 63; alleged pastoral entertainments by, 146; pastoral elements in the dramas of, 149; affiliations of, with the court, 377, perhaps aloof from literary Bohemia, 378; share of, in the Marprelate controversy, 378; wholly of the academic school, 387; medieval and Renaissance elements in the plays of, 399; his plays written for the narrow confines of the court, 399; their appeal to culture and refinement, 399; artistic and professional spirit of, 400; influential in the lifting of English drama to an art, 400; the period of Lyly, 404, 411; pastoral tone in the comedies of, 412; bibliography of, 455, 489, 525.

Lyndsay, Sir David, i, xxviii, 60, 69, 70, 77; ii, 397, 450, 451.

Lyric, the pastoral, ii, 139–140.

Lyte, M., i, 85.

Lytton, Edward Bulwer, Lord, i, xlii.

Mabbe, James, i, 206, 207.

Macaulay, G. C., i, 206, 526; ii, 185, 189.

*Macbeth*, i, xxxvi, 253, 256, 275, 298–300, 359, 360, 362, 365, 376, 511, 551, 573, 576, 578, 582, 583; ii, 28, 32, 92, 109, 413, 416, 480, 487, 503.

*Macchiavel and the Devil*, i, 316, 409; ii, 241.

Macchiavelli, N., i, 93, 99, 355, 357, 408, 409, 538; ii, 486, 487, 493.

*Machiavellus*, i, 408.

Machin, Lewis, i, 203, 204; ii, 35.

*Mack* (play of cards), i, 445.

Macray, W. D., ii, 65.

Macropedius, i, 65.

*Madcap*, ii, 262.

*Mad Couple Well Matched*, ii, 272, 273.

*Mad Lover*, ii, 218, 220.

*Mad World, My Masters*, i, 513, 547.

Madden, D. H., i, 50, 221.

*Madoc, King of Britain*, i, 306.

Maeterlink, Maurice, i, xliii.

Magic and magicians, i, 240, 386–388, 390, 394, 403.

*Magnetic Lady*, ii, 266, 267.

*Magnificat*, i, 46.

*Magnificence*, i, 56, 67, 68; ii, 397.

*Magnus Herodes*, i, 18.

Mahomet II, i, 446, 447, 449.

*Mahomet*, i, 447.

*Mahomet and Hiren*, i, 118.

Maid, the disconsolate, regarded as a creation of Beaumont, ii, 251.

*Maid in the Mill*, i, 433; ii, 129, 210, 217, 248.

*Maid of Honor*, ii, 231, 234, 532.

"Maiden, the merry resourceful," not the invention of Fletcher, ii, 251.

*Maidenhead Well Lost*, ii, 263.

*Maiden's Holiday*, i, 234.

Maidment, J., ii, 132, 302, 340.

*Maid's Metamorphosis*, i, 132, 140; ii, 151.

*Maid's Revenge*, i, 605; ii, 313, 322, 323, 324, 504, 511, 529.

*Maid's Tragedy*, i, 568, 595–597; ii, 129, 193, 195, 197, 223, 341, 413, 417.

"Main," the, of the masque, ii, 94.

Mak, i, xxviii, 18, 27, 77.

*Malcontent*, i, 488, 542, 543, 557, 587; ii, 182, 332, 339, 501.

Malespini, Celio, i, 503; ii, 292.

Malone, E., i, 102, 160, 184, 188, 196, 317, 324; ii, 21, 72, 73, 171, 228, 285, 291, 292, 301, 315, 316, 371.

Manuche, Cosmos, ii, 368.

*Mamillia*, i, 118; ii, 17.

*Mankind*, i, 55, 56; ii, 449.

Manly, J. M., i, 4, 7, 19, 23, 31.

Manningham, J., i, 378.

Mantuan, Battista Spagnuoli, ii, 139, 143.

*Marc Antoine*, ii, 6.

*Marcus Geminus*, ii, 17, 27, 57, 76.
Margaret of Navarre, Queen, ii, 292.
Margaret, Queen (wife of Henry VI), i, 263.
*Mariam, the Fair Queen of Jewry*, i, 42; ii, 8, 512.
*Marius and Sylla*. See *Wounds of Civil War*.
Markham, Gervais, i, 42, 203–204, 605; ii, 35, 516.
Marlowe, Christopher, i, xxiv, xxx, xxxii, xxxvi, 122, 140, 141, 192, 213, 405, 406, 407, 411, 412, 415, 447, 452, 500, 594; ii, 3, 18, 19, 49, 421; *Tamberlaine*, i, 84, 226, 231 (and see title); influenced by Peele's *Arraignment*, 135; the Dido of, 138, 139, 234, 266; *Faustus*, 168 (and see title); and the popular stage, 187, 245; and *Titus Andronicus*, 221; his relations to Kyd, 223, 224; his translation of Ovid's *Amores*, 224; his intimates and rivals, 224, 225; his career, 224–238; *Hero and Leander*, 225, 230, 269, 272; *Scanderbeg* attributed to, 228; his use of blank verse, 230; *Edward II*, 230, 233, 234, 260–270 (and see title); *Jew of Malta*, 232, 233, 268, 372; *Taming of a Shrew*, 234; the accusation of "atheism" against, 234–236, 238; *The Maiden's Holiday*, attributed to Day and, 234; *The Massacre at Paris*, 234; Acts of the Privy Council against, 236, 237; the death of, 237, 238; his revolt from classic conventions, 239; his influence on Greene, 244; his influence on the drama, 246; and the chronicle play, 254, 305; and collaboration, 266, 267; his part in the *Contentions*, 266; Shakespeare's obligations to, 272, 274, 275; Heywood compared with, 318; *Taming of a Shrew* ascribed to, 340; author of *Arden* likened to, 366; influence of, 367–369; imitated by Shakespeare, 368, 369; chronological relation of Shakespeare to, 378; relation of, to romantic comedy, 403; his humble birth, 523; estimate of, in *The Return from Parnassus*, ii, 69; the ballad describing, as an actor a forgery, 375; transfer of, as author from company to company of players, 377; joins the company of Shakespeare, 378; dramatic primacy of, before Shakespeare, 386; a co-worker with Shakespeare, 386; the romanticism of, 388; plays of, in Germany, 392; the heroic conception of human passion a contribution of, to the drama, 405; the period of, 405–407; dramatic rivalry of, with Shakespeare, 406; the passion and pathos of his *Edward II*, 408; bibliography of, 465–468, 472, 513.
Marly, Christopher, i, 236.
Marmion, Shakerley, ii, 275, 276; comedies of, 275–277; bibliography of, 533.
*Marriage of Mind and Measure*, i, 118.
*Marriage of Wit and Science*, i, 199; ii, 399.
*Marriage Night*, ii, 365, 537.
*Marshal Osric*, i, 304, 397; ii, 224, 309.
Marston, John, i, xxv, xl, 176, 179, 453, 493, 504, 509, 545; ii, 2, 3, 16, 27, 46, 50, 388, 392; one of the school of conscious effort, i, xxxv; prices paid, 317; the *Dutch Courtesan* of, 333; given over to comedy of manners in the reign of James, 351; and *Troilus and Cressida*, 384; satire in, 400; the comedy of manners of, 400; and the "war of the theaters," 473, 476–491; details of the life of, 477; revision of *Histriomastix* attributed to, 480; his satire, 492; his collaboration in *Eastward Hoe*, 505, 506; escapes imprisonment for the satire of that play, 507; comedy of manners of, 542–545; inequality of, 544; his plays on Antonio and Mellida a revival of the tragedy of revenge, 555, 558; his contribution to the type, 556; and the authorship of *The Insatiate Countess*, 585, 586; 602; his *Antonio and Mellida*, ii, 23; his *Antonio's Revenge*, 23; his *Sophonisba*, 26; his criticism of Jonson's classical learning, 26; identified with Furor Poeticus of *The Return from Parnassus*, 67; and the masque, 103; his *Masque* at Ashby, 107, 108, 122; his part in entertainments, 128; his *Malcontent*, 182; satirized by Jonson, 268; his *Malcontent* a source for a scene of *The Broken Heart*, 332; a gentleman born, 376; his quarrel with Jonson, 381, 410; the last great dramatist to come under the influence of Seneca, 401; protest of, against the "pedantry" of Jonson in dramatized

classical history, 410; the antagonist of Jonson in the war of the theaters, 410; his revival of the tragedy of revenge, 410, 411, 413; reminiscence of Shakespeare in, 415; bibliography of, 501, 510, 516.
Martin Marprelate controversy, i, 124, 125, 370, 474, 475; ii, 65, 378, 500, 501.
*Martin Swarte*, i, 253.
*Martyred Soldier*, i, 43, 430; ii, 45.
*Mary Magdalene*, i, 12, 29, 30, 40, 41, 52, 177; ii, 393.
*Mary Magdalene, Repentance of*, i, 38, 39; ii, 402.
Mary, Queen, i, 12, 26, 32, 33, 36, 40, 47, 60, 69, 77, 78, 87, 95, 114, 249, 287, 288; ii, 10.
Mary, Queen of Scots, i, 102, 129, 130.
Masking, ii, 128, 129, 403, 448.
Mason, John, i, 447.
Masque, the, i, 73, 74; revival of, 100; Lyly's influence on, 140; influence of, on popular drama, 179; defined, ii, 93; actors in the, 94; the dances of the, 94; parts of the masque, 94; the "entry," the "main," the "going out," 94; the nucleus of a, a dance, 94; loose contemporary employment of the term, 95; congeners of the, 95; not wholly an Italian or French innovation, 95; and early mumming and disguising, 96; complex vernacular origin of the, 97; its Elizabethan forerunners, 97–100; the accession of James gives impetus to the, 101; classification of the, 104, 105; earlier masques of Jonson, 104–109; Jonson and Daniel rivals in the, 110; cost of the, 112; difficulties at court in raising funds for, 113; retrenchment in cost of, 113; Jonson's masques of 1610–12, 113; death of Prince Henry, a temporary abatement of, 114; marriage of the Princess Elizabeth gives a renewed impetus to, 115; the grand masques of her wedding, 115–117; Bacon as a patron of the masque, 118; Jonson's masques of 1615–18, 119; other masques of the time of James, 120; falling off in expense and elaboration of, 122; last Jacobean, 123; characteristics of the Jacobean, 124; allegory in the Jacobean, 124; classical personages and imagery in the, 125; Jonson's opinion of allegory and allusion in the, 125; general want of design in the Jacobean, 126; satirical element in the, 127; place of the, among Jacobean entertainments, 127; influence of the, on the drama, 128; in Shakespeare, 129; last of Jonson's masques, 130; Townsend supersedes Jonson as writer of masques at court, 130; Shirley's monster masque, *The Triumph of Peace*, 131, 132; other court masques of Charles' reign, 133; *Comus* and private masques, 133, 134; Davenant's masques, 135, 136; masque-like plays, 136, 137; Jonson, Daniel, and Jones, and the, 411; other writers of masques, 418; bibliography of, 520–523.
*Masque of Flowers*, ii, 118, 126.
*Masque of Queens*, i, 359, 361.
*Mass, Examination of the*, i, 61.
*Massacre at Paris*, i, 234, 405, 407, 452, 551.
Massinger, Arthur, ii, 228.
Massinger, Phillip, i, xxiv, xxx, xxxvii, 290, 408, 410, 423, 430, 432, 505, 528, 544, 574, 595, 597–599, 601, 602; ii, 37–43, 242, 246–254, 282, 296, 308, 309, 312, 333, 336, 350; and *The Virgin Martyr*, i, 43, 297; and the *Fatal Dowry*, 352; and *Antonio and Vallia*, 379; and the *Old Law*, 381; a play of, on Dom Sebastian refused license, 431; his and Fletcher's *Barnavelt*, 440, 441; in tragedy, 603–606; his collaboration with Field, 603; a reviser of Dekker's work in *The Virgin Martyr*, 603; his collaboration with Fletcher, 603, ii, 185, 186, 226–230; the "notes" of, 187; his verse and style, 187, 188; rhetorical quality of the style of, 188, 189; his revision of plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, 189, 207, 210; his acquaintance with Spanish, 211, 216; *Love's Cure* ascribed to, 215; his life and career, 227, 228; his bond to Henslowe, 228; his friendship with Fletcher, 228, 229; in collaboration, 229; carries forward the traditions of Beaumont and Fletcher, 229; the tragicomedies of, 230–235; his Roman Catholicism, 231; his patrons, 232; non-extant plays of, 233, 234; contribution of, to the drama, 234, 235; his moral earnestness, characterization,

and stagecraft, 234, 235; influence of Massinger in tragicomedy on his contemporaries, 235; his comedies of English scene, 246, 252–254; his combination of Middletonian and Jonsonian comedy, 254; his types in comedy, 254; his comedies in foreign setting, 254, 255; substitution of moral earnestness for poetic justice in, 335; joins the King's company, 384; collaboration and close personal relations of, with Fletcher, 384, 386; the chief dramatic poet on the accession of Charles, 385; Shirley the chief rival of, 385; co-worker with Shirley, 386; plays of, in Germany, 392; collaborator with Fletcher, 420; a practical playwright, 420; romantic spirit in, 421; a Fletcherian in romantic drama despite moral earnestness and originality in theme, 423; his combination of Jonsonian and Middletonian comedy of manners, 423, 425; the tragicomedy of, 423, 424, 428; bibliography of, 495, 517, 526, 527, 531, 533.
Masson, D., ii, 158.
Massuccio di Salerno, ii, 213.
Master, ii, 54.
*Match at Midnight*, i, 511, 515; ii, 263.
*Match Me in London*, ii, 235, 353.
Matthew Paris, i, 11. See *Paris, Matthew.*
Matthews, B., i, 166.
Matthieu, Pierre, i, 418.
Mätzner, E., i, 15.
Maunder, Henry, i, 237.
Maurice, Prince of Orange, i, 440, 441.
*May Day*, i, 460, 462, 463; ii, 410.
May game, i, 49.
*May Lord*, ii, 166, 167.
May, Thomas, i, 572, 574; ii, 37, 48, 50, 81; his classical tragedies, 43–45; his learning, 44; his *Antigone*, 76; his tragicomedy *The Heir*, 239; his comedy of manners, *The Old Couple*, 257–259; a follower of Jonson in classical tragedy, ii, 268, 269; Heywood's word of, 383; his attempted revival of Jonsonian Roman tragedy, 425; the influence of Fletcher on, 425; bibliography of, 517.
Mayne, Jasper, ii, 219, 275, 277, 278, 365.
*Mayor of Queenborough*, i, 295, 296, 510; ii, 481.
Mayors' shows, Lord, ii, 124, 128.
McIntyre, J. L., i, 540.
McKerrow, R. B., i, 62, 390.
McLaughlin, E. T., i, 268.
Meade, Robert, ii, 84.
Mease, Peter, ii, 75.
*Measure for Measure*, i, 210, 330, 333, 372, 382, 383, 403, 523, 572, 595; ii, 183, 333, 408, 414, 491.
Medea, i, 386.
*Medea*, of Euripides, i, 34, 83; ii, 2.
Medici, the, i, 408–411, 424, 453, 586.
*Medicine for a Curst Wife*, i, 340, 504.
Medwell, Henry, i, 55, 56; ii, 28.
Meissner, J., i, 232.
*Melanthe*, ii, 80, 163.
Meleager (play given at court), ii, 3; (of Gager), 4, 59, 402, 404; (fragment), 59.
*Menæchmi* (of Plautus), i, 370, 458; ii, 99, 497; (of Warner), i, 458.
*Merchant of Emden*, i, 346.
*Merchant of Venice*, i, 137, 168, 219, 220, 372–374, 377, 469, 570; ii, 183, 219, 220, 489, 490.
*Mercury Vindicated*, ii, 119, 120, 127.
Meres, Francis, i, 137, 219, 237, 340, 372, 381, 382, 466; ii, 59.
*Merlin*, i, 386.
Mermaid, the, i, 315, 368.
*Merry Devil of Edmonton*, i, 323, 389, 498; ii, 408, 482.
*Merry Jests of Dan Hew*, i, 352.
*Merry Wives of Windsor*, i, 247, 278, 324–326, 347, 359, 372, 375, 377, 394, 455, 468, 469, 572, 575, 595; ii, 129, 408, 483.
*Messalina*, ii, 48, 49, 517.
Mewe, William, ii, 75.
Meyer, E., i, 356, 409.
*Michaelmas Term*, i, 511, 512, 526, 546; ii, 416.
*Microcosmus* (of Artour), ii, 53; (of Nabbes), 95, 137, 280.
*Midas*, ii, 150.
*Middle Temple and Lincoln's Inn*, Chapman's *Masque of the*, ii, 115, 116.
Middleton, Christopher, i, 202.
Middleton, Thomas, i, xxvi, xxxii, xxxiv, xxxvii, xlii, 193, 278, 408, 409, 433, 503, 522, 523, 526, 545, 547, 586, 589, 595, 599, 603; ii, 137, 185, 242, 244, 247, 251, 254, 273, 276, 295, 296, 304,

307, 310, 312, 379, 420, 423, 428; his representation of contemporary life, i, xxix; nature of the comedy of manners of, xxxiii; *The Roaring Girl*, 176, 327; *Your Five Gallants*, 206; *Mayor of Queenborough*, 295, 296; *Witch*, 299; compared with Shakespeare, 318; influence of, 327, 349; *Virgin Martyr* of Dekker and, 327; the *Honest Whore* of Dekker and, 338–340; and the *Fair Quarrel*, 350, 351; use of witchcraft by, 359; the *Witch* of, 361, 362; compared with *Macbeth*, 362; the supernatural in, 365; chronological relation of Shakespeare to, 378; the *Blurt* of, 380, 381; and the *Old Law*, 381; his proper work domestic drama and comedy of manners, 381; the *Old Law* of, 402; the *Love's Cure* ascribed to, 402; relation of, to romantic comedy, 403, 404; in comedy of manners, 404; his *Game at Chess*, 443–445; in danger of arrest for this play, 445; and the comedy of manners, 456; use of Plautus by, 457; dramatic satire as practised by, contrasted with that of Jonson, 492, 493, 515; writes *No Wit* for the new Hope, 497; the life and work of, 509–517; chronologer of London, 510; his city pageants, 510; his comedies of manners, 511–515; the realistic art of, 515, 516; his moderation, 516; his propriety of verse and style, 516, 517; influence of, in comedy, 518, 519; his master tragedy, *Women Beware Women*, 587; his witches, ii, 109; his *Masque of Heroes*, 122, 127; and civic pageants, 128; the masque in the plays of, 128; his and Rowley's *Spanish Gipsy*, 216; his *More Dissemblers Besides Women*, 218, romantic element in plays of, and Rowley, 236; the comedy of, as a type, 240; range of the comedies of manners of, 240, 244; later comedies of, romantic in tone, 244; collaborator with Jonson, 268; trifling with vice in the comedies of, 334; a gentleman born, 376; employed in civic pageants, 382; Heywood's word of, 383; joins the King's company, 384; his and Dekker's dramatic treatment of the conflict of woman with man, 413; reminiscence of Shakespeare in, 415; absolute realism of the comedies of manners of, 415, 416; imitators of, 416; contemporary allusion and satire of *The Game at Chess* of, 419; brutal treatment of criminal passion by, in *Women Beware Women*, 422; bibliography of, 481, 487, 493–496, 502, 503, 522, 523.

*Midsummer-Night's Dream, A*, i, xxxi, xxxvi, 137, 184, 242, 311, 372, 376, 377, 391–396, 435, 570; ii, 70, 137, 152, 169, 369, 492, 493.

Mildmay, Sir Humphrey, ii, 170, 355.

"Miles Gloriosus" as a type, i, 369, 371, 462, 539; ii, 478.

Miller, S., ii, 71.

Millet, J., i, 50.

Milton, John, i, 44, 201, 529; ii, 76, 79, 95, 120, 122, 133, 134, 158, 199, 374, 394, 446.

*Mind, Will, Understanding*, i, 56; ii, 449.

*Minerva's Sacrifice*, ii, 234.

Minstrelsy, medieval, i, 47, 48; ii, 448.

Miracle play, the, its origin in the service of the church, i, 2–8; its forerunners, 8, 9; characteristics of its growth, 9; defined, 11, 12; in England, 13; its popularity and distribution, 13, 16, 22; secularization of, 13; 16; clerical restriction of, 14; at its height, 15; comedy element in, 16; collective cycles of, 16–21; parts of cycles extant, 21; the single, 22; management and acting of, 22–24; actors, setting and costume of, 24, 25, 30; expense attending, 25; Protestant objection to, 26, Protestant influence on, i, 26, 33; last of, 26, 27; contrasted motive of the collective and single, 27; growth of the didactic element in, 28; its emergence into true drama, 40; résumé of the history of, 43; relation of the *estrife* to, 48; French miracles, on secular themes, 50; connection with the polemical morality, 60–61; farce in, and satire in, 73, 89, 309, 474; influence of, still felt in court drama, 120; ecclesiastical and civic support of, 147; the Cornish miracles, 156; family scenes in, 310; its decline, ii, 393; its restriction to fact, 394; still extant in the first decades of Elizabeth's reign, 402; bibliography of, 443–446.

Mirandola, Pico della, i, 93.

*Mirror for Magistrates*, i, 76, 96, 249, 250.
*Mirror of Knighthood*, ii, 529.
*Mirza*, i, 451.
*Miseries of Enforced Marriage*, i, 330, 334, 335, 343, 347, 366; ii, 31, 484.
*Misfortunes of Arthur*, i, 97, 105, 106, 109, 255, 256, 265, 293, 553; ii, 4, 453.
*Misogonus*, i, 65, 87–91, 113, 114; ii, 396, 451.
Misrule. See *Lord of Misrule*.
Moeller, G. H., i, 572.
Molière, Jean Baptiste, i, xliii; ii, 500.
Molina, Tirso de, ii, 315.
Moltke, M., i, 560.
*Monarchic Tragedies*, ii, 7, 14, 15, 411.
*Monsieur D'Olive*, i, 398–400, 402, 464; ii, 415.
*Monsieur Thomas*, i, 526, 527; ii, 205, 251, 505.
Montague, Walter, ii, 173, 178, 179.
Montaigne, i, 34; ii, 510.
Montemayor, Jorge, ii, 142, 152, 178, 194, 206.
Montgomery, Philip Herbert, Earl of, ii, 232.
Moorman, F. W., i, 554, 581, 582.
Morality play, i, 22, 43, 45–72, 113, 147, 194, 240, 294; rise in popularity of the, 28–30; contrasted with Miracle Play, 51–52; *Play of the Paternoster*, 52; full-scope moralities, 54–56; limited-scope moralities, 56, 57; classification of, 57; religious, 57, 58; controversial, 58–61; pedagogical moralities, 61–63; influence of foreign models 63–66; moralities of social and political satire, 67–71, 474; historical personages represented in the, 71, 72; secularizing of the, 73–92; Roman or classic influence, 82–84; interpolation of comedy and farce in, 89; influence of, on the drama, 120, 139, 262; elements of, in pre-Lylian comedy, 121, 122; staging of, 156; forerunners of the chronicle play found in the historical, 254, 255; satire in the, 474; comprehensiveness of the, ii, 394; humanist influence on the, 394; made use of as a weapon of controversy, 395; end of the controversial, with the succession of Elizabeth, 395; of social and political life alone dramatically fertile, 396; still flourishing in the earlier decades of Elizabeth's reign, 402; bibliography of, 447–451, 470, 471.
*More Dissemblers Besides Women*, ii, 236, 245, 246.
More, John, ii, 113.
More, Sir Thomas, i, 61, 78, 82, 89, 90, 93, 445, 499.
*More, Sir Thomas*, i, 169, 185, 261, 285–287, 499; ii, 479.
Morley, H., i, 74.
Morris dance, i, 49; ii, 448.
*Mors*, ii, 84.
*Mort de Cèsar*, ii, 15.
*Mortimer*, i, 268, 306, 469.
Morton, Cardinal, i, 55.
Moryson, Fynes, i, 185, 409, 586; ii, 461.
Moschus, ii, 108.
Moseley, Humphrey, ii, 212.
*Mostellaria*, i, 457, 538.
*Mother Bombie*, i, 109, 127, 128, 132, 386.
*Mother Redcap*, i, 360.
*Mother Shipton*, i, 360.
*Mountebank's Masque*, ii, 121, 122, 127.
*Mouse Trap*, i, 170.
*Mrs. Warren's Profession*, i, 339.
*Mucedorus*, i, 240–242, 245; ii, 153, 179, 407, 469.
*Much Ado About Nothing*, i, xxiv, 201, 347, 374, 375, 398, 572; ii, 489, 490.
*Mucius Scævola*, i, 118.
*Muiopotmos*, ii, 8.
Mulcaster, Richard, i, 85, 112, 213; ii, 98, 454.
*Muleasses the Turk*, i, 447.
Mullinger, J. B., ii, 53, 57, 69, 79.
*Mulmutius Dunwallow*, i, 298.
*Mulomorco*, i, 228.
Mumming, i, 73, 74; ii, 448, 470; and see *St. George's play*.
Munday, Anthony, i, 307, 308, 412, 445, 509; ii, 22, 154, 194; *Second and Third Blast against Plays* ascribed to, i, 90, 150, 151; his pamphlets against the stage evils, 150, 278; *John a Kent and John a Cumber*, 176, 284, 388, 389; *Two Italian Gentlemen*, 196; Italian influence on, 210; *Fidele and Fortunio*, 210, 211; *Owen Tudor*, 252, 253; and *Life of Cardinal Wolsey*, 253; and *The Rising of Cardinal Wolsey*, 253; and *Sir John Oldcastle*, 278; and *The Downfall of Robert, Earl of Huntington*, 279, 280; and *The Death of Robert, Earl of Hunting-*

*ton*, 279, 280; influence of, on Davenport, 304; the *Valentine and Orson of*, 379; the *John a Kent* of, 388, 389; his pamphlet on Dom Sebastian, 431; and *Love's Labor's Lost*, 476; satirized by Jonson, 478, 482; and in *Histriomastix*, 480; translator of *Palmerin d'Oliva*, 563; a frequent collaborator with Chettle, 563, 587; and civic pageants, ii, 128; his *Felix and Philomena*, 205; returns to his hereditary trade of draper, 257; the butt of Jonson's ridicule, 268; an "actor playwright," 375; Jonson's ridicule of, 381; devices of, at Norwich, 403; overingenuity of disguise in *John a Kent* by, 409; bibliography of, 458, 479.

*Mundus et Infans*, i, 54, 56.

*Mundus Plumbeus*, ii, 53.

Murder plays, i, 118–119, 343–349, 366, 455; ii, 404, 408, 486.

*Murderous Michael*, i, 119, 343; ii, 404.

Murray, J. T., i, 142; ii, 390.

Murray, Sir James, i, 507.

*Muses' Looking Glass*, ii, 85, 86, 304.

Mussato, Albertino, i, 96.

Mustapha, son of Solyman II, i, 446.

*Mustapha*, i, 446, 448; ii, 11–13, 340, 355, 496.

*Myndes, Enterlude of*, i, 39.

*Mystère du Viel Testament*, i, 19.

"Mystery play," the term, i, 11. See *Miracle play*.

Mythological pastoral school, the, ii, 148, 149.

Mythological themes, 97, 122, 127, 201, 255, 256, 295–303, 394, 395, 397; ii, 19–21.

Nabbes, Thomas, ii, 43, 247, 275, 361, 365; his *Hannibal and Scipio*, ii, 45; his *Microcosmus*, 95; his *Spring's Glory*, 133, 134, 137; his comedies: *Covent Garden*, *The Bride*, *Tottenham Court*, 279–281; his honorable and virtuous young people, 280; bibliography of, 534, 537.

*Narcissus*, i, 114–115; ii, 54, 70, 81, 518.

Nash, Thomas, i, 137; ii, 18, 19, 64, 137; on the Senecan craze, i, 98; his connection with the Marprelate controversy, 124; *Terminus et non Terminus*, his part in, 138; *Jack Wilton*, 138; *The Tragedy of Dido*, 138, 139, 234, 266; *Summer's Last Will and Testament*, 138, 139; *The Isle of Dogs*, 138; *Lenten Stuff*, 138, 203; contrasted with Kyd and Shakespeare, 192; on the popularization of Seneca, 214–216; on Kyd's *Hamlet*, 215–217; his prefatory epistle to *Menaphon*, 215, 216, 229; on Kyd's translations, 223; interpolations of, 264, 273; *Pierce Penniless*, 264; cited in regard to the Marprelate controversy 474, 475; and *Love's Labor's Lost*, 476; at Cambridge, ii, 60–62; his satirical college comedies, 60, 61; his *Have with You to Saffron Walden*, 61; identified with Ingenioso of *The Return from Parnassus*, 67; "young Juvenal" of Greene's *Groatsworth of Wit* identified with, 67; his *Terminus et non Terminus*, at Cambridge, 374; part of, in the Marprelate controversy, 378; bibliography of, 456, 457, 464, 502.

"National historical" drama, i, 247, 348 (and see *Chronicle play*); bibliography of, ii, 470–481.

National spirit and the drama, i, xxviii, 248, 249, 251, 259, 260.

*Nature*, i, 55, 56; ii, 449, 450.

*Nature of the Four Elements*, i, 76; ii, 450.

*Naufragium Joculare*, ii, 88, 401.

Neale, Thomas, ii, 84.

*Nebuchadnezzar*, i, 42.

*Necromantes*, i, 465.

*Necromantia*, i, 83.

Neilson, W. A., i, 290, 372; ii, 346.

Nennius, i, 298.

*Neptune's Triumph*, ii, 122, 124.

Nero plays, ii, 27, 35, 36, 50.

*Nero* (college play), ii, 27; (of Gwynne), 28, 76; (anonymous tragedy), 28, 34, 35, 50, 419.

*Neumæ*, i, 2.

*New Academy*, ii, 271.

*New Custom*, i, 60; ii, 395.

*New Guise*, i, 55.

*New Inn*, ii, 265, 266, 347, 483, 499.

*New Trick to Catch the Devil*, i, 389.

*New Trick to Cheat the Devil*, ii, 259, 260, 261.

*New Way to Pay Old Debts*, ii, 183, 187, 246, 252–254, 423.

*New Wonder*, ii, 244, 263, 433.

Newcastle, Margaret Cavendish, Duchess of, ii, 131, 282, 283, 346.

Newcastle, William Cavendish, Duke of,

ii, 131, 275, 282–284, 327, 374, 385, 534.
Newington Butts, the theater at, i, 145, 155, 313; ii, 49.
*News from the New World*, ii, 123, 127.
*News from Plymouth*, ii, 301, 302, 341.
*News out of Affrick*, i, 150.
Newton, Thomas, i, 97; ii, 511.
*Nice Valor*, i, 528, 529; ii, 250.
*Nice Wanton*, i, 64, 163; ii, 395.
Nicholas, Henry, i, 39.
Nicholas of Montreux, ii, 178.
Nichols, Elizabeth, i, 459.
Nichols, J., ii, 37, 38, 55, 95, 103, 114, 116, 121, 172, 180; ii, 146.
Nicholson, B., i, 490.
Nider, Johann, 361.
Night of errors, the, ii, 99.
*Night Walker*, i, 527, 547; ii, 246.
*Nigramansir*, i, 68, 386.
*Ninus and Semiramis*, ii, 18.
*No Wit, No Help Like a Woman's*, i, 457, 496, 511, 514, 546; ii, 128, 236, 416.
*Noble Gentleman*, ii, 246, 249, 250.
*Noble Spanish Soldier*, ii, 419, 421, 422, 424, 452, 495.
*Noble Stranger*, ii, 368.
*Nobleman*, ii, 237.
*Nobody and Somebody*, i, 293; ii, 102, 479, 481.
*Nominis ac Verbi Pugna*, ii, 63.
*Nonesuch*, ii, 263.
*Nonpareilles*. See *Love and Honor*.
Norris, E., 21.
North, Sir Thomas, ii, 6, 17, 21, 513.
Northbrook, John, i, xxxviii, 149, 150, 154; ii, 461.
*Northern Lass*, ii, 269, 271, 425.
Northumberland, Earl of, his players, i, 142, 465.
*Northward Hoe*, i, 327, 502, 503; ii, 502.
Norton, Thomas, i, 84, 86, 87, 94, 96, 104, 265.
*Norwich Pageants*, ii, 402.
Nottingham, Earl of, his players, i, 314.
Novellieri, the Italian, as sources for English drama, i, 454; ii, 404, 487, 488.
*Novella*, ii, 272.
*Nuptials of Peleus and Thetis*, ii, 136.

*Oberon, the Fairy Prince*, i, 395; ii, 113, 122, 130.
Obituary plays, ii, 408, 412, 413.
*Obstinate Lady*, ii, 281, 282.
*Occasion Perdida*, ii, 315.
Ochino, i, 61; ii, 446.
*Œdipus Coloneus*, ii, 12.
*Œdipus* (at court, and college), ii, 3; (of Gager), 59.
Oeftering, M., ii, 48.
*Officium* of the Mass. See *Introit*.
*Officium Pastorum*. See *Pastores*.
Ogilby, John, ii, 286.
Ogle, Sir John, ii, 256.
*Old Cheque-Book of the Chapel Royal*, i, 114.
*Old Couple* ii, 257–259.
*Old Custom*, i, 79.
*Old Fortunatus*, i, 122, 253, 284, 379, 390, 391, 404, 481; ii, 136, 169, 409, 483, 484.
*Old Law*, i, 381, 509; ii, 229, 245, 493, 503.
*Old Tobit*, i, 38.
*Old Wives' Tale*, i, 136, 137, 176, 201, 202, 240, 242, 245, 256, 386; ii, 405, 407, 456, 462.
Oldcastle, Sir John, i, 278.
*Oldcastle, Sir John*, i, 278, 279.
Oldys, William, ii, 237.
Oliphant, E. H., i, 207, 340, 401, 402, 425, etc., *passim*.
Ophelia, i, 561, 576.
*Opportunity*, ii, 313–316, 321, 428.
*Orator*, ii, 234, 249.
*Ordinary*, ii, 276.
Ordish, T. F., i, 150, 153–156, 159, 161; ii, 391.
*Orestes*, i, 118, 120; ii, 45, 402, 513.
"Orestes furies," ii, 21.
*Orgula*, i, 427.
Oriental history, themes from, i, 445–451; ii, 496.
*Orlando Furioso*, i, 119, 194, 200; ii, 190, 399, 406, 470.
Orosius, ii, 42.
*Orphan's Tragedy*, i, 562.
Orrery, Roger Boyle, first Earl of, ii, 348.
Osborne, Dorothy, later Lady Temple, ii, 367, 368.
*Osmond, the Great Turk*, i, 449; ii, 355, 496.
*Osric*, i, 304.
*Othello*, i, xxxvi, 330, 402, 468, 552, 569, 574–576, 590, 605; ii, 32, 408, 413, 508.
"Out-scenes," i, 165–166.

Overbury, Sir Thomas, the murder of, i, 585; ii, 166.
Ovid, i, xxxiv, 132, 224, 392, 538; ii, 19, 20, 70, 137, 149, 165.
*Ovid's Tragedy*, ii, 282.
*Owen Tudor*, i, 252, 253.
*Owl*, ii, 242.
*Owl and the Nightingale*, i, 48.
*Owls, Masque of*, ii, 128.
Oxford, i, 172, 321, 465, 477, 493; ii, 53, 54, 58, 73–75, 88, 89, 404, 455, 518.
*Oxford, King and Queen's Entertainment at*, i, 172.
Oxford, Edward de Vere, seventeenth Earl of, i, 123, 225; ii, 374; his players, 123, 142, 145.

*Page of Plymouth*, i, 316, 345, 346.
Pageants, i, 14, 15, 17, 23–26, 34, 73–75, 99; ii, 97, 124, 128, 444, 470, 503, 521, 522, 532.
*Parliament of Love*, ii, 347.
*Painful Pilgrimage*, i, 118.
Painter, William, i, xxix, 209, 334, 382, 585, 591; ii, 27, 30, 223, 224, 230, 272, 488, 532.
*Palantius and Eudora*, ii, 358.
*Palæmon and Arcyte*, i, 113, 115, 198.
*Palmerin d'Oliva*, i, 563.
Palsgrave, Fredrick, commonly called the Elector Palatine, his marriage with the Princess Elizabeth, i, 437; his players, 422, 495, ii, 242, 310.
Palsgrave, John, i, 35, 63–65, 94.
*Pammachius*, i, 39, 59, 60; ii, 54.
*Panacæa*, i, 119.
*Panegyre*, Jonson's, on James, ii, 101.
*Panegyric* on James, Daniel's, ii, 101.
*Pan's Anniversary*, ii, 122, 123.
*Pap with a Hatchet*, i, 125.
*Paradise of Dainty Devices*, i, 114.
*Parasitaster*, i, 176, 179, 398, 525, 544.
Parasite, the, as a type, i, 311.
*Pardoner and the Frere*, i, 79–81.
*Paria*, ii, 84, 520.
Paris, Matthew, i, 11.
Parker, Matthew, ii, 54.
*Parliament of Love*, i, 544; ii, 230, 246, 254, 255.
*Paris and Vienna*, i, 85, 118, 199.
Paris Garden, theater at, i, 155, 157.
Parnassus plays, i, 66; ii, 410, 465, 518.
Parr, Catherine, i, 95.
*Parricide*, i, 448.
Parrott, T. M., i, 463.
Parry, E. A., ii, 367.
Parsons, Philip, ii, 75.
Parsons, Robert, i, 225.
*Parson's Wedding*, ii, 302, 537.
*Parthenia*, ii, 80, 144, 178.
Parthenius of Nicæa, ii, 535.
Pasquier, Etienne, i, 420.
*Passion of Christ*, ii, 82.
*Passionate Lovers*, ii, 354, 355, 426.
*Passionate Pilgrim*, ii, 140.
Paston, Sir William, ii, 171.
*Pastor Fido*, ii, 80, 143–145, 149–151, 156, 167, 524, 525.
Pastoral drama, the, ii, 139–181; its origin and introduction into England, 139–141; its traits, 140, 141; in Italy, 143; translated, 144; beginnings of, under Elizabeth, 146; pastoral elements in the comedies of Lyly and others, 147–153; true pastoral drama in England, 156–181; Daniel's *Queen's Arcadia*, 156; *The Faithful Shepherdess*, 158; pastoral elements in *The Winter's Tale*, 161; *Hymen's Triumph*, 163; the piscatory, *Sicelides*, 164; *The Sad Shepherd*, 166–169; Shirley, Goffe, and minor pastoralists of Charles' time, 169; provincial, 171; *The Shepherd's Paradise* and its relations to Prynne, 173; Randolph's *Amyntas*, 174, 396, 425; Rutter, Cowley, and other late pastoral dramatists, 175; foreign and native sources of the pastoral drama, 177; fairies in, i, 394; in *Maid's Metamorphosis*, 394; Fletcher in, 400; premonitions of, in comedies of Peele, Lyly, and Shakespeare, ii, 412; Daniel the corypheus of, in England, 412; always an exotic in England, 412; Fletcher's failure to popularize, in England, 412; Jonson and the, 412; bibliography of, 523–526.
*Pastoral Tragedy*, i, 461; ii, 153.
*Pastores*, i, 5, 7, 8.
*Pastourelle par personnages*, i, 49.
*Palæmon and Arcyte*, ii, 57, 58, 70.
Paternoster, plays of the, i, 26, 52, 54.
Patient wife, as a dramatic theme, ii, 413. See, also, *Patient Grissil*.
*Patient Grissil*, i, 316, 329, 341, 478; ii, 483.
*Pattern of Painful Adventures*, ii, 30.
Paul's Boys, i, 111, 112, 115–117, 123–

125, 146, 147, 167, 169, 186, 204, 495, 496, 502, 509, 518, 555, 558.
Paulus Diaconus, ii, 341.
Pavy, Salathiel, i, 117.
*Pax*, ii, 54.
Payne, L. W., Jr., i, 437.
Peaps, William, ii, 171.
Pedant, the, as a typical character, 369, 371.
*Pedantius*, ii, 61, 62, 401, 404, 520.
*Pedlar's Prophesy*, i, 68.
Peele, George, i, xxiv, xxxvi, 438, 447; ii, 19, 147, 149, 152, 375, 377, 378, 394, 404; *Locrine*, i, 98 (and see title); in the court drama, 134, 135; *The Arraignment of Paris*, 134–136; *The Hunting of Cupid*, 135; and the popular stage, 135, 187; *Mahomet and Hiren*, 118, 228; *Battle of Alcazar*, 136, 227; *Edward I*, 136, 256, 261, 262; *David and Bethsabe*, 42, 43, 136; *The Old Wives' Tale*, 136 (and see title); *Jack Straw* attributed to, 136; and *The Wisdom of Doctor Dodypoll*, 136, 137; *Wily Beguiled* ascribed to, 136, 137; contrasted with other actor playwrights, 192; his use of blank verse, 230; compared with Greene, 242, 244; his influence on the popular stage, 245; his obligations to Lyly, 266; and *Henry VI*, 267; his collaboration in chronicle plays, 267; in the domestic drama, 319–321; the original *Histriomastix* assigned to, 479; assists Gager in Latin plays at Oxford, ii, 59; translates Euripides, 59, 60; and civic pageants, 128; his part in pastoral drama, 147; conspicuous with Shakespeare as an "actor playwright," 375; transfers his talents from court to the city, 377; joins the company afterwards Shakespeare's, 578; with Gager at Oxford, Lyly's rival at court, Wilson's companion on the popular stage, 404; probable author of *Locrine*, 404; parodies the Senecan craze in *Locrine*, 404, 405; parodies the heroical romance in *The Old Wives' Tale*, 405; pastoral tone in comedies of, 412; bibliography of, 456, 462, 471, 495, 525.
Pembroke circle, the, ii, 375.
Pembroke, Henry Herbert, Earl of, ii, 4, 228; his players, i, 145, 495, ii, 377, 378, 386.
Pembroke, Mary Sidney, Countess of, i, 573; ii, 4, 6, 7, 146, 512.
Pembroke, William Herbert, Earl of, ii, 232.
Penniman, J. H., i, 481, 482, 485, 487, 488, 490.
Penroodock, Master, i, 105.
*Pentimento Amoroso*, ii, 80, 144, 178.
Pepys, Samuel, ii, 158, 284.
Percy, William, i, 167, 174, 334, 464, 465; ii, 497.
Percys, the, i, xxiv.
*Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, i, 197, 293, 334, 352, 572; ii, 24, 29, 30, 198, 199, 260, 333, 414, 416, 515, 528.
*Peremides*, i, 229, 474.
*Perkin Warbeck*, ii, 297, 305, 308, 312, 327, 335, 424, 481, 535.
Perseus, i, 492.
*Perseus and Andromeda*, i, 85, 118.
Perspective, use of, in scenery, i, 173.
Pestell, Thomas, ii, 84.
Petronius Arbiter, i, 364, 462, 534.
Pettit de Julleville, i, 30.
Petty, George, i, xxix, 133.
*Phaeton*. See *Sun's Darling*.
*Pharamus*. See *Thibaldus*.
*Phedrastus and Phigon*, i, 199.
Phelan, J., i, 598.
Phelps, W. L., i, 419.
*Philaster*, i, 400, 401; ii, 29, 161, 193–204, 334, 339, 351, 383, 417, 504, 529.
*Philenzo and Hippolita*, i, 379; ii, 229.
Philip II, of Spain, i, 127, 429, 453.
Philip III, of Spain, i, 431, 453.
*Philip of Spain*, i, 429.
*Philippo and Hippolita*. See *Philenzo and Hippolita*.
Philips (first name unknown), assumed author of *Venus*, i, 203.
Philips, Sir Edward, ii, 115, 391.
Phillips, Augustine, i, 145, 182, 188; ii, 380.
Phillips, Edward, i, 231.
Phillipps, J. O. Halliwell. See Halliwell-Phillipps.
*Philoctetes*, ii, 2, 56.
*Philomanthes*, ii, 74.
*Philomela*, ii, 74.
*Philosophaster*, ii, 75.
*Philotas* (play given at court), ii, 3; (of Daniel), 103, 411.
*Philotus*, ii, 10.
*Phocas*, ii, 18, 20.
*Phœnissæ*, ii, 59.

*Phœnix*, i, 523.
Phœnix theater, the, i, 410; ii, 230, 235, 285, 329.
*Phœnix in her Flames*, ii, 358, 359, 426.
*Phyllida and Corin*, ii, 152.
Piccolomini, A., i, 462.
Pickering, John, i, 118, 120.
*Picture*, ii, 232, 309, 423, 442, 532.
*Pierce of Exton*, i, 253, 280.
Pierce of Winchesetr, i, 253.
*Pierce Penniless*, i, 264.
Piers, Edward, i, 146, 147, 473.
*Pilgrim*, ii, 205, 208, 215.
*Pilgrimage to Parnassus*, ii, 64, 65, 67, 68.
*Pinner of Wakefield*. See *George a Greene*.
Piracy, plays on, i, 291, 292.
*Piscator*, i, 83; ii, 53.
Piscatory drama, ii, 164, 179.
*Placidas*, i, 25, 94.
Plague, the, i, 148; ii, 369.
*Plantation of Virginia*, i, 292.
Platonic love in English drama, ii, 135, 346, 347; the cult of, in England, 346–348; in Suckling's *Aglaura*, 362; works on, 537, 538.
*Platonic Lovers*, ii, 135, 342, 347, 348.
Plautus, i, xxxi, xxxii, xxxv, xxxvi, 82, 86, 87, 91, 94, 111, 177, 310, 311, 341, 370, 380, 454, 457–459, 464, 522, 532, 538, 539; ii, 1, 56, 62, 78, 91, 98, 400, 401, 407, 410, 497, 500, 501, 518.
*Play of Cards*, ii, 60.
*Play of Lucre*, ii, 450.
*Play of Pastoral*, ii, 170.
*Play of Plays*, i, 151.
Players, companies of, i, xxv (and see *Companies*); development of professional, 111; children as, 111–117; costuming of, 179, 180; social status of, 185; Italian, 195, 196; ordinances against, 141–143; ii, 370; in the provinces, Scotland, and Ireland, 389–391; their visits to Holland, Denmark, and Germany, 391, 392; repertory of, abroad, 392; works regarding, 457, 458, 461, 532, 533.
Playhouse, the, i, 141–192; city's objection to, 147–151; influence of the construction of amphitheaters on, 156, 157; inn used as a, 157–159; construction of the early, 159–163; use of scenery in the Elizabethan, 161–179; structure of the stage, 162, 163; players sharers in, 182–184; admission to the, 184; in the provinces, ii, 391; closed by the plague, 369; works on, 457–461.
Plays, forbidden on Sundays, ii, 369; ordinance of Parliament to suppress, 370; census of Elizabethan, 371–373; bibliography of printed, 436, 437.
Playwrights, prices paid the, i, 315–317; Henslowe's treatment of, 315; the popular, and the gentleman author, ii, 374; adaptability the first condition of the success of the, 375; in the reign of James, 376, 377; personal relations of, 377; works upon, 437, 438, 482, 519.
*Pleasure Reconciled to Virtue*, ii, 120.
Pliny, i, 132; ii, 107.
Plummer, C., i, 108; ii, 58.
Plutarch, i, 392, 573, 574; ii, 6, 17, 21, 30, 41, 47, 249, 513, 514.
*Plutus*, ii, 54, 85, 265.
*Poetaster*, i, 167, 177, 471, 477, 484–486, 519, 529, 539; ii, 410, 499.
*Politic Father*, ii, 288, 318.
*Politic Queen*, ii, 261.
*Politician*, ii, 286, 313, 318–320, 322, 420.
Politiziano, Angelo, ii, 143.
Pollard, A. W., i, 9, 14, 54, 55, 78, 80, 88.
*Polyphemus*. See *Troy's Revenge*.
Pompey, plays on, i, 118; ii, 17, 21.
Ponet, John, Bishop of Winchester, i, 61; ii, 446.
Poole, John, ii, 293.
*Poor Man's Comfort*, i, 292; ii, 161, 162, 180, 242.
Pope, Alexander, i, 445.
Pope, Thomas, i, 145, 182, 188.
*Pope Joan*, i, 408, 409.
Popham, Sir John, ii, 327.
Popular drama, Plautus transferred by Shakespeare to the, 459; Jonson's disapproval of the, 469; satire in the, 473, 474; at the universities, ii, 52; ideals of the, 387.
*Porcie*, ii, 6.
Porta, G.-B. della, i, 197; ii, 77, 78.
Porter, Henry, i, 321–323; ii, 379, 408, 482.
*Præsepe*, the, i, 5.
Prayer for the sovereign at end of a play, ii, 257.
Preciosity, ii, 340, 345, 346, 350, 399.

*Predor and Lucia*, i, 199.
Preston, Thomas, i, 72, 120, 121, 199, 200; ii, 16, 57, 91, 451, 462.
*Prêtre qu'on Porte*, i, 352.
*Pride of Life*, i, 55, 56; ii, 449.
*Prince D'Amour*, ii, 135.
*Princess*, ii, 357.
Priscian, ii, 63.
*Prisoner*. See *Fair Anchoress of Pausilippo*.
*Prisoners*, ii, 356, 357.
Problem drama, the, *Perkin Warbeck* an example of, ii, 424.
*Processus Noe*, i, 18.
*Procopius*, ii, 41.
Prodigal son as a dramatic motive, i, 311, 331–335, 479, 480, 508, 509; ii, 396, 484.
*Prodigality*, i, 118.
Proescholdt, L., i, 241, 273, 345.
Profanity, act against, i, 498.
*Progne*, a college play, ii, 3, 57, 58.
*Promos and Cassandra*, i, 121, 181, 209, 210, 382, 478, 595; ii, 403.
*Prophetæ*, i, 8.
*Prophetess*, i, 37, 40, 569, 603; ii, 213, 215.
Protestantism and the drama, i, 25–27, 31–36, 255, 258; ii, 395.
*Proteus and the Rock Adamantine*, ii, 99, 100.
*Protomartyr*, i, 37.
Provinces, performances in the, ii, 390, 391, 461.
Prynne, William, i, 88, 89, 507; ii, 131, 173, 285, 315, 369.
*Pseudolus*, ii, 78.
*Pseudomagia*, ii, 75.
Puckering, Sir John, Kyd's letter to, i, 223, 224, 235.
Purchas, Samuel, ii, 393.
"Purge," the, in the "war of the theaters," i, 490.
*Puritan*, i, 518.
Puritanism and the theater, i, xxvi, xxxviii, 148, 149, 289; ii, 65, 81, 87, 88, 311, 335, 369, 370, 461, 518.
*Puritan Maid*, i, 518; ii, 245.
Puttenham, George, i, 113, 123.
Pynson, E., i, 57.
*Pythagoras*, ii, 20, 21.

Quarles, Francis, ii, 366, 537.
*Queen*, ii, 368, 537.
*Queen of Aragon*, ii, 368, 537.
*Queen and Concubine*, ii, 337, 338, 535.
*Queen of Corinth*, ii, 37, 206.
*Queen of Corsica*, i, 427.
*Queen's Arcadia*, ii, 80, 110, 156, 157, 163, 412, 526.
*Queen's Exchange*, ii, 337.
Queen's Revels. See *Anne of Denmark*, her players.
*Queens, Masque of*, ii, 94, 108, 109, 110, 125, 126.
*Quem Quæritis*, i, 3–5, 7, 27, 45; ii, 443.
Quinn, A. H., i, 332.
*Quinta de Florencia*, ii, 211.
Quintilian, i, 469.
*Quintus Fabius*, i, 118.

Raaf, K. H., i, 57.
Radclif, Ralph, i, 35–37, 72, 94, 109, 198, 329, 406; ii, 63.
*Raging Turk*, i, 449; ii, 81.
Rainolds, John, ii, 60, 518.
Raleigh, Sir Walter, i, 225; ii, 115.
*Ralph Roister Doister*, i, xxxi, 25, 85–87, 91, 96, 104, 193, 310, 456, 462; ii, 400, 451.
*Ram Alley*, i, 518, 546, 547.
Rambouillet, Marquise de, ii, 345, 346.
Randall, Thomas, ii, 393.
Randolph, Thomas, i, 396; ii, 85–87, 91, 174, 175, 179, 269, 275, 304, 374, 425, 519, 526.
Rankin, William, i, 252; ii, 46, 379, 388, 429.
*Rape of Lucrece*, i, 595; ii, 21, 27, 410, 516.
*Rape of the Second Helen*, i, 118.
Rapp, M., ii, 213, 219.
*Rare Triumphs of Love and Fortune*, i, 121, 122, 386; ii, 403.
Rastell, John, i, 55, 62, 79, 83, 89.
Ravenscroft, Edward, i, 222.
Rawlins, Thomas, i, 430, 606; ii, 365.
*Raymond, Duke of Lyons*, i, 422, 423.
Realism, i, 246, 250, 278, 307 (and see ch. vii, *passim*); brought about the birth of the drama, 309; enhanced by a conventional foreign setting, 325; the *London Prodigal* as an example of, 333; in the murder plays, 343–349; the supernatural and, 354; in witchcraft plays, 362–365; and the domestic drama, 364; the supernatural combined with, 385; in Day, 397; and satire, 402; the groundnote of Elizabethan drama, 454; in the

earlier drama, 454, 455; source of the comedy of manners in, 455.
*Rebelles*, i, 65.
*Rebellion*, i, 430; ii, 365, 537.
*Reconciliation, Masque of*, ii, 99.
Red Bull, i, 154, 423, 436, 496; ii, 239, 360.
*Red Knight*, i, 199.
Redford, John, ii, 395, 450.
Reformation, i, 17, 32, 61, 91; ii, 400.
*Rehearsal*, i, xxxi.
Reichard, H. A. O., i, 217.
Reinhardstoettner, K. von, i, 82.
Religious drama. See *Sacred drama*.
Renaissance, the, i, xxiii; ii, 1, 399, 452, 487.
*Renegado*, ii, 231, 235, 246, 256, 423, 532.
Rennert, H. A., ii, 143.
*Reparatus*, ii, 84.
*Repentance of Mary Magdalene*, i, 38, 39.
*Respublica*, i, 60, 69, 70.
*Restituta*, i, 39.
Restoration of Charles II, the, i, xxiii, xxiv, 177, 308, 352.
Resurrection play, i, 3, 10.
*Return from Parnassus*, i, xxxi, xl, 475, 489, 490; ii, 64–70, 502, 518.
Revels, the, i, 46, 47, 59, 75–77, 96, 100–103, 107, 109, 110, 115, 117, 122–126; permanent master of the Revels established, i, 76–77; Lyly and the mastership of the, 124–126; Jonson's failure to obtain the mastership of the, ii, 268; Astley succeeds to the, 268; Herbert succeeds to the, 268; bibliographical references on, 453, 454.
Revels, the King's. See *James I*, his company of players.
Revels, Queen's. See *Anne, Queen*, her players.
Revenge plays, i, 210–213, 219–223, 228, 246, 506.
*Revenge for Honor*, i, 448, 449, 451; ii, 355, 496.
*Revenge of Bussy D'Ambois*, i, 415, 416, 418, 564, 566, 580; ii, 3, 413.
*Revenger's Tragedy*, i, 566–568, 598, 599; ii, 128, 237, 413, 507.
*Rey Rodrigo*, i, 433.
Reynolds, G. F., i, 15, 30, 163, 164, 166–168, 171, 177–179.
Reynolds, Henry, ii, 144.
Reynolds, H. E., i, 46.
Reynolds, John, i, 599, 605; ii, 322.
Reynolds, Thomas, ii, 81.
*Rhodon and Iris*, ii, 171, 172.
Rhys, E., ii, 235.
*Ricardus Tertius*. See *Richardus Tertius*.
Rich, Penelope, i, 131.
Rich, Sir Robert, his players, i, 144.
Richard I, i, 285.
Richard II, i, 111, 157.
*Richard II*, i, 220, 273–276, 280, 285, 369, 494, 551, 576, 601; ii, 393, 472.
*Richard II, Tragedy of King*, i, 280, 477.
*Richard II, Deposing of*, i, 280.
Richard III, i, 116, 142, 252, 261.
*Richard III* (academic tragedies), ii, 92; (of Shakespeare), i, 170, 177, 220, 263, 267, 273, 274, 281, 285, 369, 576, 578, 580, 601; ii, 407; (of Rowley), 281, 422, 478.
*Richard III, True Tragedy of*, i, 264, 265, 281; ii, 471.
*Richard Crookback*, i, 281, 306.
*Richard the Confessor*, i, 261.
*Richard, Duke of York, True Tragedy of*, i, 264.
Richards, Nathaniel, ii, 37, 48–50; ii, 268.
*Richardus Tertius*, i, 97, 255, 256; ii, 59, 63, 403, 471.
Riche, B., i, 356, 374, 412, 488.
*Richmond, King and Queen's Entertainment at*, ii, 135, 522.
Rickets, J., i, 285; ii, 59.
Rider, William, ii, 237.
*Right Woman*. See *Very Woman*.
Rightwise, John, i, 83, 86, 94, 406; ii, 18.
Rime, i, 219, 257, 382. See, also, *Heroic Verse*.
Ritson, J., i, 31, 68.
*Rival Friends*, ii, 87.
*Rivales*, ii, 59, 60, 404.
*Roaring Girl*, i, 176, 327, 513, 547.
*Robart, Kynge, of Cicyle*, i, 71, 72.
Robert of Brunne, i, 14.
*Robert of Sicily, King*, i, 50, 406.
*Robert II of Scotland, King*, i, 306.
Roberts, James, i, 383.
*Robin and Marion*, i, 49.
*Robin Conscience*, i, 61.
Robin Goodfellow, i, 356, 393.
Robin Hood, plays on, i, xxviii, 49, 73, 254, 260, 283, 284; ii, 153, 155, 168, 470, 479, 491, 525.
*Robin Hood and Little John*, i, 283; ii, 154.
*Robin Hood and the Stranger*, ii, 155.
*Robin Hood's Pennyworths*, ii, 154.

Robinson, Nicholas, Bishop of Bangor, ii, 56.
*Robyn and Makyn*, i, 49.
*Roderick*, i, 562.
Rodrigo, King (of Spain), i, 433.
Roersche, A., i, 57, 58.
Rojas, F. de, i, 89.
Rolfe, William, i, 312.
Rollinson, ii, 80, 151.
*Rollo, Duke of Normandy*. See *Bloody Brother*.
*Roman Actor*, i, 603, 604; ii, 16, 38, 40, 42, 234, 308, 423, 517, 533.
*Roman de la Rose*, i, 51.
Roman history in English plays, i, xxxiii; ii, 16, 17, 21–30.
Romance, the element of, in the drama, i, xxix, xxx; its persistency, xxx, xxxi.
"Romance," as a variety of drama, defined, ii, 184; Shakespearean, ii, 416; contrasted with Fletcherian tragi-comedy, 416; bibliography of, 526–532, 534–537.
Romantic comedy, i, 367–404; of the earlier authors, 367; defects of the early, 367; artistic development of, due to Shakespeare, 367, 369–385, 391, 395; satire in Shakespeare's, 370, 384; bibliography, ii, 487–493.
Romantic drama, spirit of, in earlier drama, i, 92, 193–246, 367; relation to earlier types, 193–195; sources and influences which produced the, 195–197, 208–211, 240; the influence of Kyd on the, 210–223, 246; of Marlowe, 223–230, 246, 268, 269, 367; enfranchisement of, from classical convention, 239; characteristics of the, 239, 240, 245; the influence of Greene upon, 245; absorption of the chronicle play into the, 301–304; importance of *Two Gentlemen of Verona*, 371, 372; fullness of Shakespeare's power in, 372, 374; character of Shakespeare's romantic comedies, 376; relation of romantic comedy to comedy of manners, 377; as verging towards tragedy in the *Merchant of Venice*, 377; Shakespeare's isolation as a playwright for a time especially noticeable in, 378; romantic spirit in this interval used by other authors only as an element of relief, 379; effect of Shakespeare upon his contemporaries, 380, 381; of heroical character, 385; artificial, in the reign of Charles, 385; the supernatural in, 385–396; the wise-woman and magician in, 386; Dekker and the, 390, 391, 396; fairies as a theme in, 391–396; influence of *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, 394; Jonson's relations to the popular, 395, 396; Shakespeare's younger contemporaries in, 396–403; Day and Heywood's relation to, 397; Chapman's, 398–400; Beaumont and Fletcher's, 400–403; summary of romantic comedy, 403, 404; and the native drama, i, 309; influence of, on domestic drama, 319, 337; and the supernatural, 354, 365; the influence of Lyly upon, 369; and realism, 454; the later, ii, 182–239; traits of, 191; of Elizabeth's time contrasted with that of later periods, 191, 192; in its decadence, 307–370; superficial character of the romantic settings of Elizabethan plays, 408; bibliography of, 462–470. See, also, *Romantic comedy* and *tragedy*.
Romantic tragedy, the height of, ii, 405, 406, 412, 413.
Romanticism, the nature and influence of, i, 377; decadent, the distinctive "note" of the drama of Charles I, ii, 307, 308, 426.
Rome, i, 471, 472.
*Romeo and Juliet*, early versions of, i, 208; (of Shakespeare), i, xxv, 193, 208, 369, 372, 376, 391, 392, 570–572; ii, 4, 334, 339, 408; bibliography of, 507, 508.
*Romeus and Juliet*, i, 208.
*Romeus et Julietta*, ii, 95, 92.
Roo, John, i, 69.
Roper, William, i, 82.
*Rosania or Love's Victory*. See *Doubtful Heir*.
Rose theater, the, i, 145, 146, 153, 155, 156, 159, 313, 314, 346, 366, 460, 472, 496; ii, 22, 49, 379.
Rosenbach, A. S. W., i, 90, 599; ii, 194, 206, 208, 209, 210, 211, 215.
Roses, Wars of the, i, 252, 263.
Ross, C. H., i, 86.
Rosset, François de, ii, 208.
Rossi, V., ii, 145.
Rosseter, Philip, i, 497; ii, 190, 241.
Rounds, the Cornish, i, 156.
Rowe, N., i, 317, 324.
Rowlands, Samuel, i, 520.

Rowley, Samuel, i, 42, 307, 421, 432, 452; ii, 376, 379; *Tragedy of Richard III*, i, 281; *When You See Me You Know Me*, 288–290; a member of the Duke of York's players, 297, 307; influenced by connection with Henslowe, 318; the domestic drama of, 318, 319; and the *Bristol Tragedy*, 347; the *Witch of Edmonton*, 348, 362, and *Fortune by Land and Sea*, 349; the *Fair Quarrel*, 350, 351; his career, 422; employed by Henslowe, 422; his companies and plays, 422; authorship of, confined to Henslowe, 379; bibliography of, 495.
Rowley, William, i, 510, 511; ii, 137, 207, 239, 244, 245, 262, 263, 310, 327, 328, 376, 422, 425, 432–434, 587, 595, 599, 603; and the *Travels of Three English Brothers*, i, 178; and the *Thracian Wonder*, 204; and *The Travails of the Three English Brothers*, 291; and *Fortune by Land and Sea*, 292; and *The Birth of Merlin*, 295, 296; *The Shoemaker a Gentleman*, 296, 297; his obligations to Deloney, 297; fecundity of, 316; beloved by Shakespeare, Fletcher, and Jonson, 432; his collaborations, 432, 433; his unaided work, 433; in *The Changeling*, 599; his alleged part in *Pericles*, ii, 31; an actor in Middleton's *Inner Temple Masque*, 122; a collaborator with Fletcher, 210, 217; his and Middleton's *Spanish Gipsy*, 216; his *All's Lost by Lust*, 217; his hand in *The Maid in the Mill*, 217; his interest in Spanish topics, 217; romantic element in plays of, and Middleton, 236, 239; activity of, in later comedies, 244, 248, 262, 263; joins the King's company, 384; his master work, *All's Lost by Lust*, 425; bibliography of, 480, 481, 495, 503.
*Roxana*, i, 577; ii, 402.
Roxborough, Lord, ii, 163.
*Royal Combat*, ii, 328.
*Royal King and Loyal Subject*, i, 303, 304, 397; ii, 224, 309, 350, 425, 481, 485, 531.
*Royal Master*, ii, 286, 315, 321.
*Royal Slave*, i, 172, 449, 450; ii, 47, 48, 89, 90.
Royden, Matthew, i, 225.
Rucellai, B., i, 230.
Rueda, Lope de, ii, 194.
Ruggle, George, ii, 64, 78, 81, 519.
*Rule a Wife and Have a Wife*, i, 343; ii, 206, 213, 246, 248, 249.
Rumbaur, O., i, 198.
*Rupert, Prince Palatine*, ii, 135.
Rural life, English ideals of, ii, 153.
Rush, Friar, i, 354, 355.
Ruskin, J., ii, 201.
Rutter, Joseph, i, 427; ii, 175, 176, 179.
Rye, W. B., i, 152.
Rymer, T., i, 116.

Sackville, Sir Thomas, i, xxxi, xxxii, 84, 86, 87, 94, 96, 104, 105, 139, 187, 549, 556; ii, 3, 15, 375.
Sacred drama, the, its nature and course, i, xxvii; realistic simplicity of, xxviii; comedy in, xxviii; stock characters in, xxviii; the, i, 1–44; relation of the, to later drama, 1; origins of the, 2–9; development from church ritual, 2–16; its earlier symbolic nature, 6; effect of the doctrine of the real presence on, 6; elaborated ritual a feature of, 6, 7; liturgical character of earlier, 7, 8; changes in the growth of, 9, 10; concurrence of growth and decay in, 10, 11; early, in England, 11, 12; miracle, "mystery," and saint's play, 11, 12; secularizing of, 13, 45, 46, 73–92; clerical restrictions of, 14; height of the, as acted by the craft-guilds, 15, 16; its popular and vernacular character, 16; comedy of relief in, 16; collective miracle plays in, 16–21; single plays and parts of cycles extant, 21, 22; management and acting in, 22–24; actors, setting and costume in, 24, 25, 30; expense in, 25; effects of Protestantism on, 25–27; the latest miracle plays, 26, 27; dramatic motive in, 27; the didactic element, allegory and satire in, 28; mixed elements in the later, 29–31; decadence of, 31, 32; bible plays and Latin plays, the successors of the, 31–39; emergence of the true drama from the, 40, 41; religious plays that followed the, 41–44; secularizing influences on, 46–49; apparent realism in, 309; comedy scenes in, 309; scenes of family life in, 310; religious drama, and realistic reproduction of contemporary life, 454; satire in the, 474; relation of,

to later drama, ii, 393, 394; bibliography of, 442–446. See, also, *Biblical plays*, *Miracle plays*, *Moralities*.
*Sad One*, ii, 362.
*Sad Shepherd*, i, 284, 360, 395; ii, 113, 154, 156, 166–169, 479, 525, 526.
Saint Benedict, i, 4.
*Saint Patrick for Ireland*, ii, 286, 318.
*St. Botulph*, i, 12.
St. Bartholomew, massacre of, i, 411.
St. Brice, massacre of, i, 254.
*St. Catherine*, i, 11, 12.
St. Clara, i, 12.
*St. Clotilda*, i, 12.
*St. Fabian*, i, 12.
St. Gall, Abbey of, i, 3.
*St. Gall MS.*, i, 3.
*St. George*, i, 12; plays and pageants on, 49, 254; ii, 397, 470.
*St. George for Merry England*, i, 254.
*St. James*, i, 12.
*St. Lawrence*, i, 12.
St. Martial, Abbey of, i, 9.
St. Mary Overy's, Southwark. See *St. Saviour's*.
*St. Meriasek*, i, 12.
*St. Nicholas*, i, 8, 9.
*St. Olave*, i, 12.
St. Saviour's Church, Southwark, i, 525; ii, 228, 384.
*St. Sebastian*, i, 12.
St. Thomas of Canterbury, i, 12.
Saint's play, i, 10, 12, 29, 31.
Saintsbury, George, i, 214, 269, 299, 551; ii, 15.
Salisbury, Countess of, i, 273.
Salisbury Court, the theater in, i, 160; ii, 237, 310, 311, 318.
Salisbury, Robert Cecil, Earl of, i, 437.
Sallust, ii, 32, 33.
*Salmacida Spolia*, ii, 136.
Salorzano, A. del C., ii, 353.
Sampson, M. W., i, 588, 589; ii, 237.
Sampson, William, i, 42, 348, 605; ii, 35, 262.
*Samson*, i, 42.
*Samson Agonistes*, i, 44; ii, 394.
Sancho VIII, King of Leon, i, 430; ii, 220.
*Sanctus Edwardus Confessor*, i, 253.
Sandys, George, i, 44; ii, 394.
Sannazaro, Jacopo, ii, 139, 143, 151, 165, 177, 178, 179, 524.
*Sapho and Phao*, i, 124, 179, 387.
*Sapientia Salomonis*, ii, 75.
Sardou, Victorien, i, xliii.
*Sarpedon*, i, 118.
Sarrazin, G., i, 213, 214; ii, 67, 68.
Satire in the drama, i, xxxix, 68, 240, 309, 349, 365, 369, 370, 384, 385, 390, 397, 400, 402, 455, 468, 473–491, 522; ii, 61, 62, 64, 410, 501.
*Satire of the Three Estates*, i, xxviii, 60, 69, 70, 77; ii, 397, 451.
*Satiromastix*, i, 216, 218, 284, 447, 486, 487, 490, 502, 564; ii, 376, 379, 410.
*Satyr*, i, 395.
Saviolo, i, 93.
Saxo Grammaticus, i, 554, 560.
Scanderbeg, George Castriota, i, 447.
*Scanderbeg*, i, 228, 234; ii, 406.
Scapegrace, the, as a type, ii, 251.
Scene, indeterminate in Fletcherian tragedy, i, 602; variation of, in academic plays, ii, 72; unreality of, in later classical drama, ii, 37; change of, in *The Royal Slave*, ii, 90.
Scenery, its use on the Elizabethan stage, i, 161–179, 303; ii, 411; in the masque, ii, 98, 102, 105, 106, 109, 111, 115, 118, 126, 135.
Schelling, F. E., i, 66, 81, 103, 252, 354, 387, 469, 537; ii, 108, etc., *passim*.
Scherillo, M., ii, 143.
Schick, J., i, 211, 213.
Schiller, Friedrich von, i, 426.
Schipper, J., i, 77.
Schlegel, Friedrich, i, 286, 333.
Schmidt, Erich, i, 232.
Schoenwerth, R., i, 211.
*Scholar*, ii, 361.
*Scholemaster*, i, 37.
*Schöne Phænicia*, ii, 490.
*Schöne Sidea*, ii, 202.
School drama, the, i, xxxi, 63–66, 93–140, 104; ii, 1, 51, 52, 82, 83, 449.
Schroeer, M. M. A., i, 32, 56, 221.
Schücking, L. L., i, 132; ii, 150.
Schwab, H., i, 76, 129.
*Scipio Africanus*, i, 118.
*Scogan and Skelton*, i, 388.
*Scornful Lady*, i, 526.
Scot, Reginald, i, 132, 353, 358, 361; ii, 486.
Scotland, players in, ii, 461.
Scots, the, ridiculed in *Eastward Hoe*, i, 506, 507.
Scott, Sir Walter, i, 103, 332, 436, 537; ii, 78, 343.

2

*Scottish History of James IV*. See *James IV*.
*Scourge of Folly*, ii, 194.
*Scourge of Villany*, i, 477.
Scribe, A. E., ii, 247.
Scudéry, Madeleine de, ii, 340, 351, 357.
*Scylla's Metamorphosis*, i, 241.
*Scyros*, ii, 80, 163, 178.
*Sea Voyage*, ii, 218, 220, 238, 366.
Sebastian, King of Portugal, i, 428, 552.
*Sebastian of Portugal, King*, i, 431, 432.
*Second Maiden's Tragedy*, i, 578, 595, 597–599; ii, 511.
*Second Mrs. Tanqueray*, i, 339.
Seifert, J., i, 62.
*Sejanus*, i, xxxiii, 418, 536, 550; ii, 24–28, 34, 44, 48, 50, 268, 410, 414, 516.
Selden, John, i, 508.
*Selimus, Emperor of the Turks*, i, 194, 227, 446, 447, 449; ii, 406, 470, 471, 496.
*Selindra*, ii, 358.
Seneca, the influence of i, xxx–xxxiii, 34, 83, 87, 94, 96–98, 106, 136, 177, 209, 210, 212–216, 227, 228, 230, 239, 254–256, 264, 265, 267, 306, 386, 454, 549, 556, 569, 577; ii, 1–16, 49, 55, 59, 388, 401–404, 411, 453, 463, 511–513, 537.
*Senile Odium*, ii, 84.
*Senilis Amor*, ii, 84.
*Senora Cornelia*, ii, 207.
Serres, Jean de, i, 418.
*Serule and Astrea*, i, 285.
Servant, the humorous or contriving, as a type, i, 311, 323, 467.
Servi, Constantine de, ii, 118.
*Seser and pompie*, ii, 22.
*Sesers ffalle*, ii, 22.
*Set at Maw*, i, 445.
*Set at Tennis*, i, 445.
*Seven Champions of Christendom*, i, 197, 208, 306; ii, 360, 426.
*Seven Days of the Week*, ii, 75.
*Seven Deadly Sins*, i, 52–54, 188, 196, 401.
*Seven Sins of London*, ii, 404.
*Seven Wise Masters*, ii, 366.
*Sforza*, ii, 177.
Shakespeare, Edmund, i, 348.
Shakespeare, John, i, 271.
Shakespeare, William (for comment on the several plays, see their titles), i, xxiii, xxiv, xxxii, xl, xli, xlii, 38, 84, 98, 117, 140, 141, 143, 153, 166, 172, 173, 204, 230, 270–283, 367, 477, 505, 523, 547; ii, 423, 424; his position in the chronology of Elizabethan drama, xxv; an actor and manager, xxvi; his and Marlowe's elevation of history on the stage, xxix; his representation of contemporary life, xxix; his dominion in romantic drama, xxx; superiority of his company, his theater and his emolument, xxxv; diversity of Elizabethan drama illustrated in the plays of, xxxv; confirmed in the practice of romantic art, xxxvi; probably joined Leicester's players, 144; rivals of, 146; the company of, 145, 146, 156, 313, 317, 332, 347, 348, 366, 377–379, 383–390, 494–497; his winter theater, 154; *Fair Em*, ascribed to, i, 180, 190; contrasted with Fletcher, 181; contemporaneousness of, 181; his shares in the Globe theater, 182–184; and the popular stage, 187; may have acted in Tarlton's *Seven Deadly Sins*, 188; Italian influence on, 208–211; his obligations to Kyd, 219; *Mucedorus* attributed to, i, 240, 241; his obligations to Lyly, 242; and Greene, i, 242–244, 271, 272; and Marlowe, 246; and the historical drama, 247, 249, 250, 253, 254, 261–265, 272–279, 298–301, 307, 308; and collaboration, 266, 267; his early career, 269–272; his *Venus and Adonis*, i, 271, 272; and the chronicle play, i, 272; his obligations to Marlowe, 274, 275; *Sir Thomas More* attributed to, 286; *Thomas Lord Cromwell*, attributed to, 286; *The Birth of Merlin* attributed to, 295, 296; name of not in Henslowe, 315; and the Earl of Southampton, 317; success of, 318; Dekker, Heywood, Jonson, and Middleton compared with, 318; comedy of popular school compared with that of, 318; the *Merry Devil* ascribed to, 323; *Merry Wives* his only domestic drama but displays his preëminence, 324, 325; naming of characters and place of setting indifferent to, 325, 326; his life contrasted with Dekker's, 328; faithful wife and jealous husband in, 330; and the *London Prodigal*, 333; relations of Jonson and Fletcher with, 342; and the authorship of *Arden*, 345; *Yorkshire Tragedy* ascribed to, 347; influence of, 349; fond of the

theme of family reunion, 352; use of witchcraft by, 359, 360; the supernatural in, 365; the domestic drama of, 366; special influence of, in romantic comedy, 367; position and success of in 1595, 367, 368; promise of, indicated by non-dramatic poems, 367; Southampton's influence on the career of, 368; circumstances of his life and fortunes in 1595, 368; introduced and played a part in Jonson's *Every Man in His Humor*, 368, 466, 488; standing of, as a dramatist in 1595, 368; the *Love's Labour's Lost* of, 369, 370; this play his only use of satire, 370; the romantic comedy of, 370–385, 391–395, 403; the simple romantic art of, 371; character-drawing of, 371, 375, 376, 380; qualities as a writer of comedy, 372; *Merchant of Venice* last play to show traces of an art other than his own, 372; "unconscious art" in, 373; atmosphere of his comedies essentially English, 375; incident and character in the romantic comedy of, 376; noble patronage a factor in the success of, 377, 378; isolation of, for a time as a writer of comedy an element in his success, 378, 403; influence of his treatment of romantic character on his contemporaries, 380; darker and graver tone of three later romantic comedies, 381; *Troilus and Cressida* unlike him, 383–385; returns to ideals of the old court drama, but with added poetry, in *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, 391, 392; the fairies of, 391–395; Chapman's *Monsieur D'Olive* compared with, 399; development of, in romantic comedy, 403; scenes in France in the historical plays and comedies, 411; his name coupled with Rowley's, 433, exceptional character of *Comedy of Errors*, 458, 459; eclecticism of his earlier art, 459; significant preference of, for history and romance rather than classical sources and models, 459; contrasted with Jonson as regards his portrayal of character, 468, 469; the comedy of, 469; supposed satiric allusions in, 475, 476; not satirized by Jonson, 478; or in *Histriomastix*, 480; assumed to be Virgil in *Poetaster*, 484; relation of to the "war of the theaters" in general, 488–491; allusion to, in the *Return from Parnassus*, 490; his name second to Lawrence Fletcher among the King's players, 494; alleged borrowings of Jonson from, 539, 540; reminiscence of, in Marston's *Antonio and Mellida*, 555; Jonson and, in rivalry in the rewriting of *Hamlet* and the additions to *The Spanish Tragedy*, 558; his cavalier treatment of the old material of *Hamlet*, 559; imaginative portraiture the end of, in *Hamlet*, 559; reminiscence of, in *Hoffman*, 563; his treatment of the passion of love, 572; his treatment of the passion of jealousy, 575; his treatment of the trial of woman's chastity restricted to comedy, 595; in tragedy, 583, 584; the unmatchable truth of his pen, 584; *The Second Maiden's Tragedy* ascribed to, 598; his personal relations with Jonson, ii, 25; his contempt for the mob, 29, 30; contemporary estimate of his poetry in *The Return from Parnassus*, 69; his plays on classical subjects, ii, 28–32; his disregard of unessentials, 32; reminiscences of, in May's *Antigone*, 45; and the universities, 91, 92; the masque in, 95, 128, 129; and the pastoral, 154–156, 161, 180, 181; his "romances," 184, 197–204; his collaboration with Fletcher, 185, 190; later verse of, 186, 187; average number of his plays yearly, 189; his penchant for dukes and kings, 191, alleged likenesses to the tragicomedies of Fletcher, 197; plays included among, 197; anachronisms of, 199; personages of, not wanting in individuality, 200; lifelikeness of the personages of, 200, 201; divergences of, from tragicomedy, 203, 204; not profoundly influenced by it, 204; *The Double Falsehood* attributed to, by Theobald, ii, 212; reminiscences of, in Fletcher, 220; in Massinger, 233; influence of, stronger on his modern critics than on his contemporaries, 220; the first folio of, 232; perhaps a collaborator with Jonson, 268; popularity of the plays of, in Charles' reign, 308; Roman plays of, accepted as veritable history, 312; alleged relationship of, to Davenant, 340; the predecessors of, in no sense a *coterie*,

378; almost alone among earlier notable dramatists as an "actor playwright," 375; efforts of, to obtain a grant of arms, 376; writes for but one company of players, 377; the success of, attracts other playwrights to his company, 379; familiar acquaintance of, with his fellow workers, 379; recognized as a man and a dramatist by Chettle, 379; succeeds to the head of his profession, 379; friendship of, for Jonson, 380; visited by Jonson and Drayton, 380; Burbage, Heming, and Condell the closest intimates of, 380; Earl of Southampton the patron of, 380; not a cultivator of "great ones," 380; steady industry and substantial success of, 381; praised for "copious industry" by Webster, 382; Heywood's couplet on, 383; relations of, to Fletcher, 383, 386; a co-worker with Marlowe, 386; plays of, in Germany, 392; popularity of, in Germany in the seventeenth century, 392; acted at sea by contemporary sailors, 392, 393; his acquaintance with the classics, 400; his imitative period, 407; from the death of Marlowe to the accession of James, the period of Shakespeare, 407–409; supereminence of, in the chronicle play, 408; work of, in domestic drama not confined to *The Merry Wives*, 408; supereminence of, in romantic comedy, 409; his representation of classical history on the popular stage, 410; rewrites *Hamlet* in rivalry of Jonson's revision of *The Spanish Tragedy*, 411; pastoral tone in early comedies of, 412; the great tragedies of, 413; the plays of, on classical story, 414; the "romance" of, contrasted with Fletcherian tragicomedy, 416, 417; not seriously affected by Fletcher's innovations, 416, 417; strictly an Elizabethan, 418, 423, 424; his guidance of the taste of his public, 420; less a complete dramatist than Fletcher, 421, 422; general bibliography of, 456, 458, 465, 466, 469, 470, 472–475, 479, 482, 483, 485, 487, 495, 498, 501–503, 531; biographies of, 473; critical and historical works, 473, 474; order of plays, 474; the text, 474; grammar and language, 474; blank verse, 475; folios, 476; historical plays, 477, 478, 480; earlier comedies, 488–493; tragedies, 506–509; dramas on classical subjects, 513; classical learning, 513, 514; tragicomedies and romances, 527–529.

Shank, John, a player, i, 182.

Sharp, Lewis, ii, 368.

Sharp, T., i, 23, 24, 56.

Sharpham, Edward, i, 518.

*She Saint*, ii, 242.

Shelley, Percy Bysshe, i, xlii.

Shelton, Thomas, i, 206; ii, 207, 208, 212.

*Shepherd's Holiday*, ii, 175, 176.

*Shepherds, Play of the.* See *Pastores.*

*Shepherds' Play, Second*, of the Towneley cycle, i, 46.

*Shepherds' Paradise*, ii, 173, 178.

Sheridan, Richard Brinsley, i, xxxiii; ii, 416.

Sherwood Forest, ii, 154, 155.

Shilleto, A. R., ii, 329.

Shirley, the three brothers, travelers, i, xxxix, 291.

Shirley, Henry, i, 43, 293, 430; ii, 45.

Shirley, James, i, xxx, xxxvii, 410, 430, 443, 452, 514, 527, 594, 595, 605, 606; ii, 108, 169, 171, 179, 235, 247, 282–297, 307, 308, 312–328, 333, 336–338, 361, 365, 377, 385, 424; the assumed reviser of comedies of Middleton, i, 514; his use of classical story, ii, 43; his part in entertainments, 128; and the masque, ii, 129; his *Triumph of Peace*, its sumptuousness and great cost, 131–133; his earlier career and activity as a playwright, 284, 285; in Ireland, 285, 286, his later career as schoolmaster and translator, 286; his comedies of London life, 286–297; edited Beaumont and Fletcher, 286; his death by exposure, 286; plays of, in Ireland, 286; his comedies, 286–297; alleged collaboration of, with Chapman, in *The Ball*, 291, 292; *The Gamester* and the attacks upon it, 293, 294; later comedies of manners of, 295; eminence of, in comedies of contemporary life, 295; his types, favorite situation, and adequacy, 295–297, 324; romantic dramas of, 312–326; lighter comedies, 314–316; "historical" tragicomedies of, 316–320; tragicomedies of intrigue of, 320–326; heroines of, 321, 322; tragedies

of, 322–326; in tragedy, 326; revived simplicity and ingenuity of plot in, 335; simplified plot of, and the heroic play, 351; the chief rival of Massinger, 385; writes for Queen Henrietta's players at the Cockpit, 385; joins the King's company, and becomes their chief poet, 385; the closing of the theaters a bar to the career of, 385; a co-worker with Massinger, 386; the last of the great Elizabethan dramatists, 386; in Dublin, 391; a practical playwright, 420; influence of the return of, to simplicity of plot, and its influence on the heroic play, 426, 427; the period of, 427, 428; the industry, competency, and success of, 427, 428; the independence of, and his use of previous drama, 428; the comedies of, as pictures of Caroline life, 428; reason for his qualified success, 428; bibliography of, 522, 534.
*Shoemaker a Gentleman*, i, 433; ii, 481.
*Shoemaker's Holiday*, i, 285, 297, 327, 329, 379, 408, 481, 493, 500; ii, 483.
Shore, Jane, i, 282, 283, 499.
*Shore's Wife*, i, 282.
Shrew, the, in the drama, i, 339, 341, 413.
Shrewsbury, i, 493; ii, 83.
Shrewsbury, Elizabeth, Countess of, i, 129, 130.
Shrewsbury, Talbot, Earl, of, i, 129, 130, 142, 264, 273.
*Sicelides*, ii, 80, 164–166, 172, 179, 525.
*Sicily and Naples*, i, 410; ii, 364.
Sidney, Sir Philip, i, xxix, 84, 129, 131, 151, 167, 172, 178, 181, 197, 199, 240, 300, 478, 541, 591; ii, 4, 9, 10, 48, 59, 63, 98, 140, 145, 150, 152, 176, 178, 179, 194, 318, 365, 374, 403, 510, 525, 526, 555.
*Siege* (of Cartwright), ii, 47; (of Davenant), 47, 342.
*Siege of Dunkirk*, i, 291.
*Siege of London*, i, 261, 499.
*Siege of Rhodes*, ii, 348.
*Siege of Urbin, The*, ii, 358.
Sierra Leone, Shakespeare acted at sea off, ii, 392.
Sigismond, Emperor, i, 254.
*Silent Woman*. See *Epicœne*.
*Silvanus*, ii, 80, 152.
*Silver Age*, ii, 19, 20, 513.
*Silvia*, ii, 80, 170.
Simons, Joseph, ii, 84.
Simpson, R., i, 190, 191, 241, 266, 286, 287, 346, 413, 476, 479, 480.
Singer, H. W., i, 345.
*Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamydes*, i, 114, 121, 136, 180, 199, 200, 240, 244, 386; ii, 399, 402, 462.
*Sir Giles Goosecap*, i, 463; ii, 497.
*Sir John Mandeville*, i, 291.
*Sir John Oldcastle*, i, 278, 279.
*Sir Martin Skink*, ii, 262, 270.
*Sir Placidas*, i, 203.
*Sir Thomas More*, i, 169, 185, 261, 285–287, 499; ii, 479.
*Sir Thomas Wyatt, The Famous History of*, i, 252, 261, 287, 288; ii, 480.
*Siriz, Dame*, i, 49.
*Sisters*, ii, 313, 322.
*Six Fools*, i, 119.
Skeat, W. W., i, 7, 50.
Skelton, John, i, 56, 67, 68, 82, 386; ii, 397, 450.
Slater, Martin, ii, 20.
Sly, Christopher, i, 170.
Sly, W., i, 188.
Small, R. A., i, 482, 542.
Smeaton, O., ii, 67.
Smith, A., ii, 238.
Smith, G. C. Moore, ii, 61–63, 82.
Smith, Homer, ii, 147, 160, 167, 169, 171, 172, 176, 178, 179.
Smith, L. Toulmin, i, 16.
Smith, Wentworth, i, 253, 254, 413, 429, 436, 521, 562, 587; *Thomas, Lord Cromwell*, attributed to, 286; collaborated on *Six Yeomen*, i, 347.
Smyth, A. H., ii, 30.
Snelling, Thomas, ii, 81.
*Soldan and the Duke*, i, 446.
*Soldier*, ii, 361.
*Soliman and Perseda*, i, 201, 214, 219, 446, 552; ii, 464, 465, 496.
*Solitary Knight*, i, 118, 199.
Solorzano, Alonso del Castillo, ii, 353.
Solyman II, i, 446, 453.
*Solymannidæ*, ii, 76, 446; ii, 11, 496.
Somerset, Robert Carr, Earl of, i, 585; ii, 118.
Somerset, Countess of. See *Essex, Countess of*.
Sommer, H. O., ii, 139.
*Somnium Fundatoris*, ii, 74.
"Sons of Ben," the, ii, 91, 269.
*Sophister*, ii, 84.
Sophocles, ii, 1, 55, 56.
*Sophomorus*, ii, 75.

*Sophonisba.* See *Wonder of Women.*
*Sophy*, i, 451.
Sorgel, A., ii, 93, 129, 137.
*Sottie*, the, i, 80, 99.
Southampton, Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of, i, 272, 317, 378; ii, 380.
Southwark, i, 525.
Spanish sources and influence in English drama, i, 402, 419, 428–434; ii, 494, 525, 529, 530, 534.
*Spanish Curate*, ii, 210, 246, 248, 505, 530.
*Spanish Duke of Lerma*, i, 430.
*Spanish Fig*, i, 421.
*Spanish Gipsy*, ii, 217, 218, 236, 245, 495.
*Spanish Lovers*, ii, 348.
*Spanish Moor's Tragedy*, i, 222, 223; ii, 428, 452, 495.
*Spanish Tragedy*, i, 76, 84, 167, 170, 210–214, 218–222, 234, 256, 483, 552–557, 559, 571, 579; ii, 378, 401, 405, 407, 411, 428, 429, 434, 436, 452, 464, 478.
*Spanish Viceroy*, ii, 232, 234.
*Sparagus Garden*, ii, 272.
*Spartan Ladies*, ii, 355.
Speed, John, ii, 80, 170.
Spedding, James, i, 286.
Spenser, Edmund, i, xxix, 61, 122, 128, 129, 197, 199, 213, 216, 227, 268, 289, 356, 393; ii, 4, 8, 10, 15, 61, 68, 76, 125, 139, 152, 165, 166, 399.
Spenser, Gabriel, i, xxv, 466; ii, 379.
Spiera, Francis, ii, 402.
*Spightful Sister*, ii, 303.
*Spirita*, i, 196.
*Spoil of Antwerp*, i, 436.
*Sponsus*, i, 9, 10.
*Spring's Glory*, ii, 134.
*Spurius*, ii, 75.
Stage, statutes against the, i, 141, 142, 148, 149, 498; ii, 369, 370, 460; and staging in the Elizabethan drama, i, 161–179, 184, 464, 472, 473; ii, 411, 455, 457–461.
*Staple of News*, ii, 264, 265, 273, 499.
*Steel Glass*, i, 66, 492.
*Stella*, i, 7.
Stephen, King, i, 252.
*Stephen, King*, i, 252.
Stephens, John, ii, 14.
*Stepmother's Tragedy*, i, 345, 346.
Sterne, Laurence, ii, 298.
Stettin, Duke of, i, 42, 447.
Stevenson, William, i, 86, 87, 311.
Stichomythia, ii, 15.
Stiefel, A. L., i, 402, 456, 459, 462; ii, 211, 214, 288, 315, 317.
Still, Bishop, i, 86.
Stirling, Earl of. See *Alexander, Sir William.*
Stockwood, John, i, 149, 150.
*Stoicus Vapulans*, ii, 81.
Stoll, E. E., i, 204, 288, 399, 415, 425, 433, 500, 502, 542, 543, 566, 588, 591, 592; ii, 244.
*Stonehenge*, ii, 80, 170.
Stopes, C. C., i, 120.
Stow, John, i, 12, 74, 189, 298, 346; ii, 458.
Strada, Famianus, ii, 330.
Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, ii, 88, 361.
*Strange Discovery*, ii, 48, 359, 360.
Strange, Ferdinando, Lord, his players, i, 144, 145, 314; ii, 377, 378, 411.
Straparola, i, 324.
Stratford, i, 324; ii, 92, 380.
Stratton, C., i, 604.
Strode, William, ii, 81, 82, 89, 374, 520.
Struijs, Jacob, i, 570.
*Strylius*, ii, 56.
Stubbs, Philip, i, xxxviii, 151.
*Studentes*, i, 65.
Stuhlweissenburg, a play on the capture of, i, 447.
*Stukeley, Captain Thomas, Famous History of*, i, xxxix, 227, 285–287, 431; ii, 479.
Stymmelius, i, 65.
Suckling, Sir John, i, 606; ii, 275, 364, 374, 385; his *Brennoralt*, i, 423, 442; the pseudo-romantic art of *Aglaura*, 449, 450; his *Aglaura*, ii, 182; his Platonic letters to "Aglaura," 346; spendthrift and riotous career of, 361; the romantic dramas of, 361–364; conspiracy and exile of, 361, 362; friendship with Charles I, 361; suicide of, in Paris, 362; bibliography of, 536.
Suetonius, ii, 35, 41.
Suffolk, Earl of, ii, 105.
*Suffolk, Life of the Duchess of*, i, 304, 594; ii, 481.
*Summer's Last Will and Testament*, i, 138–139, 245; ii, 137.
*Sun's Darling*, i, 175, 396; ii, 43, 137, 297, 327.

Supernatural, the, in the drama, i, 244, 259, 299, 321, 353–365, 385–396, 403, 569; ii, 191, 486, 493, 508. See *Devil, Legends, Myth, Witches.*
*Supposes*, i, 104, 105, 110, 121, 196, 210, 341, 457; ii, 58, 92, 401, 453.
*Suppositi*, i, 104, 196, 457.
Surrey, Henry Howard, Earl of, i, xxix, 129, 286.
*Susanna, Comedy of the Most Virtuous*, i, 38.
*Suscitatio Lazari*, i, 8.
Sussex, Bridget, Lady Fitzwalter, Countess of, ii, 7.
Sussex, Earl of, his players, i, 146, 314.
Swaen, A. E. H., i, 292.
*Swaggering Damsel*, ii, 303.
Swan theater, the, i, xxxiv, 146, 153, 161, 162, 166, 174; ii, 241, 459.
Swarte, Martin, i, 252.
*Swetnam the Woman Hater Arraigned*, ii, 237, 238, 532.
Swinburne, Algernon Charles, i, xlii, 344, 345, 419, 461; ii, 34, 168.
Swinerton, Sir John, i, 521.
Swinhoe, Gilbert, i, 449.
*Swizzer*, i, 410, 427; ii, 338, 339, 535.
Swoboda, W., i, 78.
Sword dance, the, i, 49; ii, 448.
*Sylla Dictator*, ii, 17.
Symbolism, of the Elizabethan stage, i, 179; hostile to art, 309.
Symmes, H. S., i, 14, 149.
Symonds, John, i, 144.
Symonds, J. A., i, 94, 202; ii, 166.

Tacitus, ii, 26, 35.
Tailor, Robert, i, 350, 521.
Talbots, the, i, xxiv.
*Tale of a Tub*, i, 326; ii, 267.
*Tambercame*, i, 229.
*Tamburlaine*, i, xxvi, 84, 122, 180, 226–231, 238, 239, 268, 269, 407, 429, 447, 552; ii, 17, 19, 191, 405, 406, 467.
*Tamer Tamed*, i, 341–343, 525; ii, 251, 282, 413.
*Taming of a Shrew*, i, 234, 340; ii, 485.
*Taming of the Shrew*, i, 105, 170, 323, 372, 377, 457, 458, 572; ii, 92, 326, 340, 341, 408, 413, 438, 485, 486.
Tamora, i, 573, 585.
*Tancred and Gismunda*, i, 106, 109, 193, 209, 210, 239, 401, 403, 553, 571; ii, 4, 453, 462.
Tanger, G., i, 217.
Tarlton, Richard, i, 84, 187–189, 200, 257, 261, 262, 281; ii, 375, 377; *The Famous Victories of Henry V*, i, 188; *The Seven Deadly Sins*, 188; contrasted with other actor playwrights, 192; *News Out of Purgatory*, 324; *Seven Deadly Sins*, 401; an "actor playwright," ii, 375; a writer for the Queen's company, 377; his *Seven Sins of London*, a medley play, 404; *The Famous Victories of Henry V* probably by, 404; bibliography of, 458, 471.
*Tarrarantantara*, ii, 61.
Tasso, Torquato, ii, 139, 142, 143, 147, 151, 175, 178, 179, 205, 223, 230, 409, 524, 525.
Tatham, John, i, 606; ii, 172, 365.
Tavern, the, i, 368.
Taylor, John, i, 85, 112; ii, 360.
Taylor, Joseph, ii, 122, 243.
Taylor, Tom, i, xlii.
*Technogamia*, ii, 81.
*Tell Tale*, ii, 239.
*Tempe Restored*, ii, 130.
*Tempest*, i, 377, 380, 386, 392, 394; ii, 129, 202, 203, 416, 528, 529.
Temple, Sir William, ii, 367.
*Temple of Love*, ii, 135, 345, 522.
*Temptation of our Lord*, i, 33.
Ten Brink, B., i, 9, 18, 29, 48.
Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, i, xlii.
Terence, i, 82, 95, 104, 111, 127, 457, 461, 464; ii, 1, 497, 518.
*Terens in English*, i, 82.
*Terminus et non Terminus*, i, 138; ii, 60, 374.
Terrill, Sir William, i, 486.
*Tethys' Festival*, ii, 106, 111–113, 126.
Textor, J. Ravisius, i, 65, 87, 89; ii, 137, 400, 451.
*Theagines and Chariclea* (by Hunnis), i, 115; (by Gosson), ii, 48.
Theater, the, i, xxv, xxvi, 143–146, 149, 153–155, 159, 160, 182, 216, 299, 312–314, 317, 365, 368, 385; ii, 369, 458, 460.
*Thebais*, i, 425.
Theobald, Lewis, ii, 212.
*Theobald's, Entertainment of the Two Kings at*, ii, 94.
Theocritus, i, 386; ii, 165.
*Theomachia*, ii, 75, 81.
*Thersites*, i, 83, 87–89, 91, 92; ii, 400, 451.

*Thesmophoriazusæ*, ii, 46.
*Thibaldus*, ii, 81, 402, 520.
*Thierry and Theodoret*, i, 408, 423–425, 453, 590, 601, 603; ii, 193, 341, 419, 425, 495.
*Thomas Dough*, i, 521.
*Thomas Strowde*. See *Blind Beggar of Bednal Green*.
*Thomas, Lord Cromwell*. See *Cromwell*.
Thompson, E. N. S., i, 21, 149, 151, 475; ii, 60, 89, 90, 174.
Thoms, W. J., i, 347.
Thorndike, A. H., i, 206, 212, 217, 401, 402, 424, 525; ii, 128, 130, 145, 146, 150, 193, 197, 200, 203, 416, 553, 556, 557, 565, 566.
Thou, Jacque Auguste de, i, 417, 418.
*Thracian Wonder*, i, 170, 204, 205, 433; ii, 153, 156, 236, 462.
*Three Estates, Satire of the*, i, 60, 69, 70, 79.
*Three Ladies of London*, i, 68, 189, 372.
*Three Laws of Nature*, i, 55, 56; ii, 446.
*Three Lords and Three Ladies of London*, i, 68, 189, 372.
*Three Plays in One*, i, 401.
*Three Sisters of Mantua*, i, 119.
*Three to One*, i, 293.
*Thyestes*, i, 213, 577.
Tibbals, K. W., i, 364; ii, 224.
Tiberius, ii, 26.
Ticknor, G., i, 431.
Tieck, L., i, 190, 323.
*Time Vindicated*, ii, 124.
*Time's Complaint*, ii, 74.
*Timoclea*, i, 85.
*Timoclea at the Siege of Thebes*, i, 118.
*Timon*, ii, 92, 515, 516, 528.
*Timon of Athens*, i, 569; ii, 29–32, 92, 198, 199, 414.
Timour Khan, i, 552.
*'Tis Pity She's a Whore*, ii, 312, 328–330, 335–337, 339, 422, 535.
*Titus Andronicus*, i, 179, 219–222, 229, 344, 369, 428, 429, 434, 449, 552, 570, 573, 576, 585, 594; ii, 19, 406, 465.
*Titus and Gisippus*, i, 118, 199.
*Titus and Ondronicus*, i, 221.
*Titus and Vespacia*, i, 220.
*Tobias*, i, 42.
Tofte, Robert, ii, 178.
Tolman, A. H., i, 105, 165, 340, 341, 458, 559.
Tomkins, John, ii, 70.
Tomlinson, J., ii, 390.
*Tom Tyler and His Wife*, i, 81, 310, 312, 340; ii, 402, 451, 485.
*Tomumbeius*, i, 447; ii, 496.
*Too Good to be True*, i, 521.
*Tooly*, i, 119.
Tourneur, Cyril, i, 497, 597, 598, 602, 604; his life and literary work, 564; his tragedies of revenge, 564–568; his alleged part in *Timon of Athens*, ii, 31; the masque in the plays of, 128; his lost play, *The Nobleman*, 237; his effort to outdo the horrors of *Hoffman* in his *Atheist's Tragedy*, 413; his *Revenger's Tragedy*, the *ne plus ultra* of its kind, 413; bibliography of, 507.
*Towneley Plays*, the, i, xxviii, 17–23, 46, 77; ii, 444.
Townsend, Aurelian, ii, 104, 130.
Tragedy, Elizabethan, possibility of indigenous, indicated in the domestic drama, i, 345; supernatural in, 386; of revenge, 401, 410–413, 553, 555–568, 600–602, ii, 3; romantic nature of, i, 549; range and variety of, 549; 550, 551; historical personages not always distinguishable from imaginary in, 551; the two early vital plays of, 551; the conqueror plays, 552; the revenge type of, set by *The Spanish Tragedy*, 553; the revenge type of, 553–568; other tragic themes, rarity of the supernatural as a chief motive of, 569; the fall of princes as a motive in, 569; the passion of love in, 569–574; Cleopatra in, 572–574; the passion of jealousy in, 574–576; the ghost in, 576–584; motives of, in Jacobean times, 584, 585; the noble harlot as a theme for, 585–587; Webster in, 587–594; the trial of woman's chastity as a theme in, 595–600; influence of Beaumont and Fletcher in, 600–602; decrease in popularity of, 600, 601; less affected than comedy by the ideals of tragicomedy, 601; indeterminate scene and stock situations and personages in, 602; confusion of comedy with, ii, 313; steps in the ethical decline in, exemplified, 422; bibliography of, 505.
Tragicomedy, the rise of the, i, 400; Fletcherian, contrasted with Shakespearean "romance," 416; defined, i, 182–184; Jacobean use of the term, 182; its characteristics, 182, 183; both

realistic and romantic, 184; origin of, 184; contrasted with Elizabethan romantic drama, 192; ingenious plots of, 192; its method of surprise and variety, 192; its unreality, 192; typical personages in, 195, 197; contrasted with Shakespearean "romance," 197, 198; of Fletcher, 203–227; variety in kind and source, 204–206; indeterminateness of scene, 205; Spanish sources in the, 205–216; wholly derived from Spanish romances, 215; not directly affected by contemporary Spanish drama, 216; Shakespearean reminiscences in, 220; moral taint in the, 222, 225; bibliography of, 526–532.
*Traitor*, i, 410, 452, 595; ii, 313, 323, 324.
*Trapolin Supposed a Prince*, ii, 281.
*Trappolaria*, ii, 77, 78.
*Travails of the Three English Brothers*, i, 178, 291, 292, 433.
Travel and adventure, plays dealing with, i, 291–293; ii, 191.
Traverse, the, i, 162–164, 166, 168–171.
*Tres Reges*. See *Stella*.
*Tres Sibyllæ*, ii, 92.
*Tretise of Miraclis Pleyinge*, i, 15.
*Trial of Chivalry*, i, 379, 398, 413.
*Trick to Catch the Old One*, i, 512, 515, 526, 546; ii, 254.
*Triplicity of Cuckolds*, i, 504.
*Tristram of Lyons*, i, 203.
*Triumph of Beauty*, ii, 137.
*Triumph of Death*, i, 401, 568, 569.
*Triumph of Honor*, i, 401.
*Triumph of Love*, i, 401.
*Triumph of Peace*, ii, 131, 132, 285.
*Triumph of Time*, i, 401.
*Triumphs of Truth*, i, 510.
*Troas*, i, 97.
*Troilus and Cressida*, i, xxxii, 383–385, 463, 480, 484, 490, 543, 572; ii, 16, 21, 29, 198, 491, 492, 502.
*Troilus ex Chaucero*, i, 37, 198.
Troparia. See *Tropes of the Mass*.
Tropes of the Mass, i, 2–5, 10, 17, 46; ii, 443.
*Troubles of Queen Elizabeth*. See *If You Know Not Me*.
*Troublesome Reign of King John*. See *John, Troublesome Reign of*.
*Troylous and Pandor*, i, 198.
*Troy's Revenge*, ii, 20.
*True Tragedy of Richard III*. See *Richard III*.
*Truth*, i, 85, 118.
*Truth's Supplication to Candlelight*, i, 289, 504.
Tudor, Owen, i, 252.
Tudors, the, i, 74, 98, 100, 263; ii, 205; plays on the, 287–291, 479, 480.
*Tully's Love*, i, 472.
Tupper, J. W., ii, 350.
*Tu Quoque*, i, 497, 519.
Turks, the, i, 408, 445, 446, 451.
*Turkish Mahomet and Hiren the Fair Greek*, i, 228, 447.
Turner, William, 61.
Turner, W. H., ii, 391.
*Twelfth Night*, i, xxiv, xxxvi, 54, 197, 374, 375, 377, 399, 456, 463, 464, 468, 572; ii, 77, 205, 416, 489, 491, 530.
*Twelve Months, Masque of the*, ii, 114, 127.
Twine, Laurence, ii, 30.
*Twins*, ii, 237.
*Two Angry Women of Abington*, i, 321–323, 326; ii, 408, 482.
*Two Gentlemen of Verona*, i, 239, 371, 372, 378, 391, 569; ii, 194, 205, 206.
*Two Italian Gentlemen*, i, 196.
*Two Lamentable Tragedies*, i, 346, 347, 550; ii, 486.
*Two Maids of Mortlake*, i, 499, 519.
*Two Merry Milkmaids*, i, 389, 439, 440.
*Two Merry Women of Abington*, i, 322.
*Two Murders in One*, i, 346, 347, 550; ii, 486.
*Two Noble Kinsmen*, i, xxxii, 569; ii, 129, 198, 229, 336, 383, 522, 528.
*Two Noble Ladies*, ii, 239.
*Two Shapes*, i, 509.
*Two Sins of King David*, i, 37.
*Two Tragedies in One*, i, 346, 347, 500; ii, 486.
*Two Wise Men and the Rest Fools*, ii, 257.
Tyler, John, i, 258.
Tylney, Sir Edmund, i, 102, 498; ii, 453.
*Tyrant*, i, 598; ii, 234.

Udall, Nicholas, i, xxxi, 59, 77, 83–86, 91, 94, 112, 311, 375; raised funds by performance of *Placidas*, 25; his career, 94–96; *Placidas* assigned to, by Chambers, 94; helped translate Erasmus's *Paraphrase of The New Testament*, 95; *Ezechias*, 95; published

an anthology of Latin authors, 95; and Ochino's *Tragœdia de Papatu*, 95; his *Ezechias* at Cambridge, ii, 56; bibliography of, 451, 452.
Ulrici, H., i, 384.
*Ulysses and Circe*, ii, 120, 126.
*Ulysses Redux*, ii, 3, 59, 404.
*Una Causa Dos Efectos, De*, ii, 249.
Underhill, J. G., ii, 206, 209.
*Understanding*, i, 56.
*Unfortunate General*, i, 413.
*Unfortunate Lovers*, ii, 342, 348.
*Unfortunate Mother*, ii, 365, 537.
*Unfortunate Piety*, ii, 234.
Ungemach, H., i, 13, 19, 131, 193.
*Unhappy Fair Irene*, i, 449.
Unities, the, i, 469.
Universities, plays at the. See *College drama*.
*Unnatural Combat*, i, 578, 583, 604; ii, 226, 511, 532.
Urban IV, Pope, i, 14.
Urfé, Honoré D', ii, 346, 351.
*Usurping Tyrant*, i, 598.
*Uter Pendragon*, i, 296, 510.

*Valenciennes Passion*, i, 30.
*Valentinian*, ii, 38, 40, 41, 417, 595.
*Valetudinarium*, ii, 84.
*Valiant Scot*, i, 253, 306; ii, 481.
*Valiant Welshman*, i, 295, 302; ii, 481.
*Vallia and Antonio*, i, 379; ii, 229.
*Valteger*, i, 296.
Vanbrugh, Sir John, i, xxxiii, xlii; ii, 416.
Vandyke, Sir Anthony, ii, 251, 252.
Van Gundy, J. L., ii, 78.
*Variety*, ii, 283, 284.
Vaughan, Henry, i, 237, 238.
Vega, Lope de, i, 336; ii, 205, 208–211, 315–317.
*Venesyon comodey*, i, 328.
*Venus, the White Tragedy*, i, 203.
Vergil, i, 213; ii, 18, 43, 139, 142, 286.
Verity, A. W., ii, 58, 59.
Verneuil, Mlle. d'Entragues, the Marquise de, i, 416, 421.
*Versipellis*, ii, 84.
*Vertumnus*, ii, 73, 74.
*Very Woman*, i, 586; ii, 206, 232, 233, 235, 238.
*Vestal Virgin*, ii, 362.
Vice, the, i, 53–54, 79.
*Victoria*, ii, 62, 82, 520.
Viehoff, H., ii, 29.
Villains of the Elizabethan drama, i, 576.
Vincent, Thomas, ii, 83, 520.
*Virgin Martyr*, i, 43, 297, 328, 569, 603, 604; ii, 37–40, 229, 234.
*Virgin Widow*, ii, 366, 537.
*Virtuous Octavia*, i, 573.
*Vision of Delight*, ii, 120.
*Vision of the Twelve Goddesses*, ii, 102, 103.
*Vita Sancti Thomæ*, i, 12.
*Vitoria Corombona*. See *White Devil*.
Vives, J. L., i, 90, 93.
*Vocacyon*, i, 33.
Vogel, E., i, 68.
Volder, William de, i, 35, 63–65, 81, 94.
*Volpone*, i, 524, 529, 532, 533, 536; ii, 52, 91, 415, 499, 500.
Von Raumer, F., i, 416.
*Vortigern*, i, 296.
Voss, Jan, i, 220.
*Vow Breaker, or the Fair Maid of Clifton*, i, 348, 349.

Wadeson, Anthony, i, 279, 280.
Wager, Lewis, i, 38, 39; ii, 402.
Wager, William, i, 208, 209.
Wagner, A., i, 231.
Wagnerian opera, ii, 107.
Wakefield, i, 18.
Walker, H., i, 389.
*Walks of Islington*, ii, 303.
Wallace, M. W., i, 82, 83, 458; ii, 53.
Wallace, Sir William, i, 253, 306.
*Wallenstein*, i, 442, 452, 553.
Waller, Edmund, ii, 10, 342, 346.
Walsingham, Sir Francis, i, 115, 224, 225.
Walsingham, Thomas, i, 237.
"War of the theaters," the, i, xl, 385, 476–491; ii, 410, 501, 502.
*War Without Blows and Love Without Suit*. See *Thracian Wonder*.
Warburton, John, and the *Warburton MSS.*, i, 37, 234, 254, 333, 379, 421; ii, 39, 229, 234, 238, 249, 262, 276.
Ward, the pirate, i, 292.
Ward, A. W., i, 14, 19, 31, 130, 148, 201, 208, 231, 244; ii, 67, 86, and *passim*.
Ward, John, ii, 380.
*Ward*, ii, 84.
*Warlamchester*, i, 261.
Warner, G. F., i, 179, 328, 411, 430; ii, 239.
Warner, Walter, i, 225.
Warner, William, i, 250, 294.

*Warning for Fair Women*, i, 346, 347, 366, 486.
Warnke, K., i, 241, 273, 345.
*Wars of Cyrus*, i, 227; ii, 17, 18, 406, 513.
Wars of the Commonwealth, i, xxiv.
Wars of the Roses, i, 63.
Warton, T., i, 25, 31, 32, 37, 47, 68; ii, 55.
Warwick, John, Earl of, i, 79; his players, 144, 263.
*Wasps*, ii, 265.
Waters, W. E., i, 364.
Watson, Edward, ii, 53.
Watson, John, ii, 55, 56, 374.
Watson, Thomas, i, 37; ii, 2, 144, 147.
*Way to Content all Women*, ii, 238, 262.
*Weakest Goeth to the Wall*, i, 378, 412, 453, 496.
*Wealth and Health*, ii, 449.
*Weather, Play of the*, i, 79.
Weber, H., ii, 211, 249.
Webster, John, i, 230, 409, 412, 423, 433, 493, 497, 502, 509, 587; ii, 22, 236, 237, 312, 328, 333, 376, 377, 379, 382, 420; and *The Thracian Wonder*, i, 204; and *The Famous Victories of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, 287, 288; and the *Late Murder of a Son*, 349; the name, forged in Henslowe, 411; his collaboration with Dekker in comedies of London life, 502, 503; his employ with Henslowe, 587; his collaboration with Marston, Dekker, and others, 587–589; his sources and use of material, 590, 591; as a tragic dramatist, 592–594, 597, 603; his *Appius and Virginia*, ii, 38; his part in civic pageants and like entertainments, 128; in later comedies of manners, 244; estimate of the literary labors of his contemporaries in the drama by, 382; Heywood's verse on, 382; *The Duchess of Malfi* by, written for the King's company, 384; bibliography of, 494, 502, 507, 509–511, 513.
*Wedding*, ii, 296, 315.
*Weeding of Covent Garden*, ii, 272.
*Welbeck, Love's Welcome to*, ii, 131.
Wendell, B., ii, 200.
Westcott, Sebastian, i, 112.
Westminster, i, 465.
*Westward for Smelts*, i, 324.
*Westward Hoe*, i, 502, 503, 587; ii, 502.
Wever, Thomas, i 62.
Whalley, P., ii, 25.
*What You Will*, i, 488, 544; ii, 501.
Wheatley, H. B., i, 146; ii, 284.
*When You See Me You Know Me*, i, 288–290, 422; ii, 480.
Whetstone, George, i, 180, 195, 382, 478, ii, 403; *Promos and Cassandra*, i, 121, 181, 209, 210; *Heptameron of Civil Discourses*, 210; bibliography of, 463.
Whitaker, Lemuel, i, 316, 380.
White, Robert, ii, 121.
*White Devil*, i, 330, 568, 583, 585, 587–589, 592, 594; ii, 414, 494, 510.
Whitefriars theater, the, i, 154, 437, 497, 521.
Whitelocke, B., ii, 132.
Whitgift, John, Archbishop of Canterbury, i, 474.
Whittington, Sir Richard, i, 499.
*Whore of Babylon*, i, 289, 359.
*Widow*, i, 520; ii, 244, 266, 503.
*Widow of Watling Street*, i, 498.
*Widow's Prize*, ii, 262.
*Widow's Tears*, i, 352, 462, 463.
Wife, the faithful, as a dramatic theme, i, 329–339; ii, 484. See, also, *Patient Grissil*.
*Wife for a Month*, i, 430; ii, 205, 219.
Wiggin, P. G., i, 433, 511, 515, 517, 599.
Wilcocks, Thomas, i, 149.
*Wild Goose Chase*, ii, 246, 247.
Wilde, George, ii, 83, 170.
Wilkins, George, i, 291, 334, 335, 347, 433; ii, 31, 484.
*Will*, i, 56.
*Will of a Woman*, i, 399, 461.
William I, i, 259.
William II, i, 262, 486.
William Longbeard, i, 253.
*William the Conqueror*, i, 259, 261.
William the Silent, i, 104.
Williams, R. F., ii, 174.
Willis, R., ii, 390.
Wilmot, Robert, i, 106, 209; ii, 4.
Wilson, Arthur, i, 200, 410; ii, 336, 338, 339, 385; plays of, 338, 339; *Observations of my Life*, by, 338; *History of Great Britain* by, 338; bibliography of, 486, 535, 536.
Wilson, R., i, 68, 84, 187, 189, 233, 244, 252, 253, 278, 349, 357, 372; ii, 32, 375, 377, 397, 404, 486.
Wiltshire, possible origin of "*Ludus Coventriæ*" in, i, 202.

*Wily Beguiled*, i, 136–137, 312, 319, 320.
Winchester, Bishop of. See *Gardiner*, *Stephen*.
Wingfield, Anthony, ii, 62, 519.
Winstanley, William, ii, 71, 173, 436.
*Winter's Tale*, i, 54, 180, 204, 205, 330, 575; ii, 32, 129, 130. 161, 162, 175, 198–202, 416, 469, 528.
Winwood, Sir Ralph, i, 307; ii, 113.
Wirth, L., i, 4.
*Wisdom of Doctor Dodypoll*, i, 136, 330, 386, 394, 398, 435.
*Wisdom of Solomon*, i, 509.
Wise man. See *Magician*.
*Wise Man of Westchester*, i, 284, 360.
Wise woman, the, i, 386.
*Wise Woman of Hogsdon*, i, 335, 359; 499; ii, 413.
*Wit and Will*, i, 118.
*Wit and Science*, ii, 395, 450.
*Wit at Several Weapons*, i, 526, 546.
*Wit in a Constable*, ii, 278.
*Wit in a Madness*, ii, 270.
*Wit of a Woman*, i, 458.
*Wit Without Money*, i, 353, 354, 358–365, 403, 527, 546; ii, 109, 246, 251.
Witch, the, ii, 109.
*Witch*, i, 299, 361, 511; ii, 245, 487, 503.
Witch and witchcraft, the, i, 299, 300.
*Witch of Edmonton*, i, 348, 362, 363; ii, 297, 327, 419.
*Witch of Islington*, i, 360.
*Witch Traveller*, i, 360.
Wither, George, ii, 139, 164.
*Wits*, ii, 300, 301, 341.
*Wit's Misery*, i, 41, 216, 554.
*Witty and Witless*, i, 79.
*Witty Fair One*, i, 544; ii, 282, 288–290, 296.
*Wizard*, i, 360.
Wolsey, Cardinal, i, 69, 83, 93, 252, 287, 569; ii, 18, 95.
*Wolsey, Life of Cardinal*, i, 253.
*Wolsey, Rising of Cardinal*, i, 253.
*Woman Hater*, i, 525, 526; ii, 190.
*Woman in the Moon*, i, 110, 169; ii, 137, 150.
*Woman is a Weathercock*, i, 519; ii, 128, 503.
*Woman's Mistaken*, ii, 261, 262.
*Woman Killed with Kindness*, i, 204, 283, 336, 337, 343, 363, 445; ii, 413.
*Woman Never Vexed*. See *New Wonder*.
*Woman's Plot*. See *Very Woman*.
*Woman's Prize*. See *Tamer Tamed*,
*Woman Will Have Her Will*. See *Englishmen for My Money*.
Women at the public theaters, i, xxxviii; on the stage, 199, 200.
*Women Beware Women*, i, 409, 586, 589; ii, 128, 325, 414, 422, 494.
*Women Pleased*, ii, 209, 210, 251, 505.
"Women's plays," ii, 218, 219, 237, 238.
*Wonder of a Kingdom*, ii, 235.
*Wonder of Women*, i, 176, 578; ii, 26, 27, 410, 414, 516.
Wood, Anthony à, i, 438; ii, 53, 170, 277, 283, 284, 286.
Wood, H., i, 480.
Woodberry, G. E., i, 243.
Woodbridge, Elizabeth, i, 461, 468, 469, 535, 536.
Woodes, Nathaniel, ii, 402.
Worcester, the "playhouse" at, ii, 391.
Worcester, Earl of, his players, i, 146, 314, 332, 365, 413, 495; ii, 243.
Wordsworth, William, i, xl; ii, 141.
*Work for Cutlers*, ii, 84.
*World and the Child*, ii, 449, 450.
*World Runs on Wheels*, i, 461.
*World Well Tost at Tennis*, ii, 137.
*World's Folly*, i, 522.
*Worse Afeared than Hurt*, i, 504.
Worth, R. M., ii, 390.
Wotton, Sir Henry, i, 214, 521; ii, 134.
*Wounds of Civil War*, i, 241; ii, 16, 17.
Wright, James, ii, 122, 302.
Wright, W. A., i, 102, 299; ii, 94, 107.
Wroth, Lady Mary, ii, 318.
Wülker, R. P., i, 48.
Wyatt, Sir Thomas, i, xxix, 129, 587.
*Wyatt, Famous History of Sir Thomas*, i, 252, 261, 287, 288; ii, 480.
Wycherley, William, i, xlii; ii, 273, 298.
Wyclif, John, i, 52.
Wylley, Thomas, i, 59, 75.
Wyndham, G., i, 574.

Xenophon, i, 227.

Yarrington, Robert, i, 346.
Yelverton, Christopher, i, 105.
Yonge, Bartholomew, ii, 194.
York, the royal house of, i, xxiv.
York, Charles, Duke of, his players, i, 297, 495.

*York and Lancaster, Contentions*, i, 261, 264, 265, 267; ii, 471.
*York Plays*, i, 10, 15–18, 20, 23, 26, 43, 46, 52; ii, 444, 445.
*Yorkshire Tragedy*, i, 330, 335, 347, 352, 366, 550; ii, 412, 484.
*Young Admiral*, ii, 315–317, 322.
Young, K., i, 80.
*Your Five Gallants*, i, 206, 513.
*Youth*, i, 62; ii, 450.

*Zeno*, ii, 84.
*Zenobia*, ii, 18.
Zouche, Richard, ii, 82–84.
*Zulziman*, i, 447.

THE END

The Riverside Press
CAMBRIDGE . MASSACHUSETTS
U . S . A

Boston Public Library
3 9999 10503 446 4